THE HISTORY OF POPISH Tranſubſtantiation.

To which is Premiſed and oppoſed

The CATHOLIC DOCTRIN OF THE *HOLY SCRIPTURE*,

The *Antient Fathers* and the *Reformed Churches*, About the Sacred Elements, and Preſence of CHRIST in the Bleſſed *Sacrament* of the *Euchariſt*.

Written in Latine

By the Right Reverend Father in GOD

JOHN,

Late Lord Biſhop of *DURHAM*,

And allowed by him to be publiſhed a little before his Death, at the earneſt requeſt of his Friends.

The Second Edition.

London: Printed for *Henry Brome* at the Gun at the Weſt end of St. *Pauls*. 1679.

Tittenhanger Library.

Effigies D. Joannis Corin Episcopi
Dunelmensis &c

BRITISH MUSEUM

To the Right Honourable,

HENEAGE Lord *FINCH*,

Baron of *Daventry*, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of *England*.

My Lord,

THe Excellency of this Book anſwers the greatneſs of its Author, and perhaps the badneſs of the Verſion is alſo proportioned to the meanneſs of the Tranſlator. But the *Engliſh* being for thoſe that could not underſtand the Original that they alſo might be inſtructed by ſo inſtructive a Diſcourſe, I hope with them my good intent will excuſe my fault; only my fear is,

I ſhall want a good Plea where-with to ſue out my pardon for having intituled a perſon of the higheſt honour to ſo poor a labour as is this of mine. My Lord, theſe were the inducements which ſet me upon this attempt, it being the ſubject of the Book, to clear and aſſert an important truth, which is as a Criterion whereby to know the Sons of the Church of *England* from her Adverſaries on both hands, thoſe that adore, and thoſe that profane the bleſſed Sacrament; theſe that deſtroy the viſible Sign, and thoſe that deny the inviſible Grace: I thought I might juſtly offer it to ſo pious and ſo great a Son of this Church, who own'd her

her in her moſt calamitous condition, and defends her in her happy and moſt envied reſtauration. I was alſo perſwaded that the Tranſlation, bearing your illuſtrious name, would be thereby much recommended to many, and ſo become the more generally uſeful. And I confided much in your goodneſs and affability, who being by birth and merits raiſed to a high eminency, yet doth willingly *condeſcend to things* and perſons *of low eſtate.*

My Lord, I have only this one thing more to alledge for my ſelf: That beſides the atteſtation of publick fame which I hear of a long time ſpeaking loud for you, I

have theſe many years lived in a Family where your Vertues being particularly known are particularly admired and honoured; ſo that I could not but have an extraordinary reſpect and veneration for your Lordſhip, and be glad to have any occaſion to expreſs it. If theſe cannot clear me I muſt remain guilty of having taken this opportunity of declaring my ſelf

Your Lorſhips

Moſt humble and

moſt obedient Servant

Luke de Beaulieu.

THE PUBLISHER TO THE READER.

IT *is now nineteen years ſince this Hiſtorical Treatiſe was made by the Right Reverend Father in God* John Coſin, *when (in the time of the late accurſed Rebellion) he was an Exile in* Paris *for his Loyalty and Religion's ſake; for being then commanded to remain in that City by his gracious Majeſty that now is, (who was departing into* Germany *by reaſon of a League newly made by the* French *King with our wicked Rebels) he was alſo ordered by him, as he had been before by his bleſſed Father,* Charles *the Firſt, a Prince never enough to be commended, to perform Divine Offices in the Royal Chappel, and to endeavour to keep and confirm in the Proteſtant Religion, profeſſed by the Church of* England, *his fellow-Exiles, both of the Royal Family and others his Country-men who then lived*

in

In that place. Now the occasion of his writing this Piece was this: When his Gracious Majesty had chosen Colen *for the place of his residence, being solemnly invited, he visited a neighbouring Potent Prince of the Empire, of the Roman Perswasion; where it fell out, as it doth usually where Persons of different Religions do meet; some Jesuits began to discourse of Controversies with those Noblemen and Worthies, (who never forsook their Prince in his greatest straights, but were his constant Attendants, and Imitators of his ever constant Profession of the Reformed Religion) charging the Church of* England *with Heresie, especially in what concerns the Blessed Sacrament of the Lords Supper. They would have it, that our Church holds no real, but only a kind of imaginary presence of the Body and Bloud of Christ; but that the Church of* Rome *retained still the very same faith concerning this sacred Mystery, which the Catholick Church constantly maintained in all Ages; to wit, that the whole substance of the Bread and Wine is changed into the substance of the Body and Bloud of Christ, and right-well called Transubstantiation by the Council of* Trent. *This, and much more to the same purpose was pronounced by the Jesuits, in presence of His Majesty and the* German *Prince, with as much positiveness and confidence, as if it had been a clear and self-evident truth owned by all the Learned.*

His

To the Reader.

His Sacred Majeſty, and his Noble Attendants knew well enough that the Jeſuits did ſhameleſly belie the Church of England, *and that their brags about Roman Tranſubſtantiation were equally falſe and vain: But the German Prince having recommended to the peruſal of thoſe Honourable Perſons that followed the King a Manuſcript wherein (as he ſaid) was proved by Authentick Authors all that had been advanced by the Jeſuits. They thought it fit to acquaint the Reverend Dr.* Coſin *with the whole buſineſs, and intreat him that he would vindicate the Church of* England *from the Calumny, and plainly declare what is her avowed Doctrine and belief about the true and real Preſence of Chriſt in the Bleſſed Sacrament. Hereupon our worthy Doctor, who was ever ready and zealous to do good, eſpecially when it might benefit the Church of God, fell preſently to work, and writ this excellent Treatiſe as an Anſwer to the Prince's Manuſcript, that if thoſe worthy Perſons pleaſed they might repay his Highneſs kindneſs in kind: Yet notwithſtanding the ſolicitations of thoſe that occaſioned it, and of others that had peruſed it, he would not yield to have it made publick while a few months before he died; becauſe having compoſed it for particular Friends, he thought it ſufficient, that it*

it had been useful to them. But the Controversie about the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, being of late years resumed with much vigour, and even now famous by the learned and eloquent Disputes of Monsieur Claude, *Minister of the Reformed Church in* Paris, *and Monsieur* Arnold *Doctor of* Sorbon, *and others, who moved by their example, have entred the Lists. The reiterated and more earnest importunities of his friends obtained at last his consent for the publication of this Work; and the rather, because he thought that the Error constantly maintained by the famous Doctor of* Sorbon *was by a lucky anticipation clearly and strongly confuted throughout this Book, for whatever the Fathers have said about the true and real Presence of the Body and Bloud of Christ in the Sacrament, that stout* Roman *Champion applies to his Transubstantiation, and then crows over his Adversaries supposing that he hath utterly overthrown the Protestants cause; whereas there is such a wide difference, as may be called* a great Gulf fixed *betwixt the true or real Presence of Christ in the Lords Supper, and the Transubstantiation of the Bread and Wine into his Body and Bloud. This last is such a Prodigie as is neither taught by Scripture, nor possible to be apprehended by faith; it is*

repugnant

repugnant to right reaſon, and contrary to ſenſe; and is no where to be found in Ancient Writers: But the other is agreeable to Scripture, and to the Analogy of faith; it is not againſt Reaſon, although being ſpiritual it cannot be perceived by our bodily ſenſes, and it is back'd by the conſtant and unanimous Doctrine of the holy Fathers. For it makes nothing againſt it, that ſometimes the ſame Fathers do ſpeak of the Bread and Wine of the holy Euchariſt as of the very Body and Bloud of Chriſt, it being a manner of ſpeech very proper and uſual in ſpeaking of Sacraments to give to the ſign the name of the thing ſignified: And however they explain themſelves in other places, when they frequently enough call the Sacramental Bread and Wine Types, Symbols, Figures, and Signs of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt; thereby declaring openly for us againſt the Maintainers of Tranſubſtantiation. For we may ſafely, without any prejudice to our Tenet uſe thoſe Expreſſions of the Ancients which the Papiſts think to be moſt favourable to them, taking them in a Sacramental ſenſe, as they ought to be; whereas, the laſt mentioned, that are againſt them, none can uſe, but by ſo doing he neceſſarily deſtroys the whole contrivance of Tranſubſtantiation, it being altogether inconſiſtent

ſiſtent to ſay, the Bread is ſubſtantially changed into the Body of Chriſt, and the Bread is a Figure, a Sign, and a Repreſentation of the Body of Chriſt. For, what hath loſt its being can in no wiſe ſignifie, or repreſent any other thing: Neither was ever any thing ſaid to repreſent and be the Figure and Sign of it ſelf. But this is more at large treated of in the Book it ſelf.

Now having given an account of the occaſion of writing and publiſhing this Diſcourſe, perhaps the Reader will expect that I ſhould ſay ſomething of its excellent Author: But ſhould I now undertake to ſpeak but of the moſt memorable things that concern this great Man, my thoughts would be overwhelmed with their multitude, and I muſt be injurious both to him and my Readers, being confined within the narrow limits of a Preface. But what cannot be done here may be done ſomewhere elſe, God willing. This only I would not have the Reader to be ignorant of, That this Learned man and (as appears by this) conſtant Profeſſor and Defendor of the Proteſtant Religion was one of thoſe who was moſt vehemently accuſed of Popery by the Presbyterians before the late Wars, and for that reaſon bitterly perſecuted by them, and forced to forſake his Country; whereby he ſecured himſelf from the violence

lence of their Hands, but not of their Tongues; for ſtill the good men kept up the noiſe of their clamorous Accuſation even while he was writing this moſt ſubſtantial Treatiſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation.

John Durel.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

1. *The Real, that is, true and not imaginary Preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is proved by Scripture.* 2 *and* 3. *Yet this favours not the Tenet of Tranſubſtantiation, being it is not to be underſtood groſly and carnally, but ſpiritually and Sacramentally.* 4. *The nature and uſe of the Sacraments.* 5. *By means of the Elements of Bread and Wine, Chriſt himſelf is ſpiritually eaten by the Faithful in the Sacrament.* 6. *The eating and preſence being ſpiritual are not deſtructive of the truth and ſubſtance of the thing.* 7. *The manner of Preſence is unſearchable, and ought not to be preſumptuouſly defined.*

1. THoſe words which our bleſſed Saviour uſed in the inſtitution of the Bleſſed Sacrament of the Euchariſt, *This is my body which is given for you; This is my bloud which is ſhed for you, for the remiſſion of ſins,* Mat. 26. 26. Luk. 22. 19.

are held and acknowledged by the Universal Church to be most true and infallible: And if any one dares oppose them, or call in question Christs Veracity, or the truth of his words, or refuse to yield his sincere assent to them, except he be allowed to make a meer figment or a bare figure of them, * we cannot, and ought not, either excuse or suffer him in our Churches; for we must embrace and hold for an undoubted truth whatever is taught by Divine Scripture. And therefore we can as little doubt of what Christ saith, *Joh.6.55 My flesh is meat indeed, and my bloud is drink indeed*; which, according to St. *Paul*, are both given to us by the consecrated Elements: For he calls the Bread, *the Communion of Christs Body*, and the Cup, *the Communion of his bloud.*

* As *G. Calixtus* writes in some place of his learned Exercitations; and before him *M. Chemnitius, in Exam. Con. Trid. atque in locis Theol.*

1 Cor. 10. 16.

2. Hence it is most evident that the Bread and Wine (which according to St. *Paul* are the Elements of the holy Eucharist) are neither changed as to their substance, nor vanisht, nor reduc'd to nothing; but are solemnly consecrated by the words of Christ, that by them his blessed body and bloud may be communicated to us.

3. And

3. And further it appears from the ſame words, that the expreſſion of Chriſt and the Apoſtle, is to be underſtood in a Sacramental and myſtick ſenſe; and that no groſs and carnal preſence of body and bloud can be maintained by them.

4. And though the word *Sacrament* be no where uſed in Scripture to ſignifie the bleſſed Euchariſt, yet the Chriſtian Church, ever ſince its Primitive ages, hath given it that name, and always called the preſence of Chriſts body and bloud therein, Myſtick and Sacramental. Now a Sacramental expreſſion doth, without any inconvenience, give to the ſign the name of the thing ſignified: And ſuch is as well the uſual way of ſpeaking, as the nature of Sacraments, that not only the names, but even the properties and effects of what they repreſent and exhibite, are given to the outward Elements. Hence (as I ſaid before) the Bread is as clearly as poſitively called by the Apoſtle, *the Communion of the body of Chriſt.* Exod. 12. 21. 1 Cor. 10. 3, 4.

5. This alſo ſeems very plain, that our Bleſſed Saviour's deſign was not ſo much to teach, what the Elements of Bread and Wine are by nature and ſubſtance, as what is their uſe and office and ſignification in this Myſtery: For the body and

bloud of our Saviour are not only fitly repreſented by the Elements, but alſo, by vertue of his inſtitution really offered to all, by them, and ſo eaten by the faithful Myſtically and Sacramentally; whence it is, that *he truly is and abides in us, and we in him.*

Joh. 6. 56.

6. This is the ſpiritual (and yet no leſs true and undoubted than if it were corporal) eating of Chriſt's fleſh, not indeed ſimply as it is fleſh, without any other reſpect (for ſo it is not given, neither would it profit us) but as it is crucified and *given* for the redemption of the world; neither doth it hinder the truth and ſubſtance of the thing, that this eating of Chriſt's body is ſpiritual, and that by it the ſouls of the Faithful, and not their ſtomachs, are fed by the operation of the Holy Ghoſt: For this none can deny, but they who being ſtrangers to the Spirit and the divine vertue, can ſavour only carnal things, and to whom, what is Spiritual and Sacramental, is the ſame as if a meer nothing.

Mat. 26. 26.

7. As to the manner of the preſence of the body and bloud of our Lord in the Bleſſed Sacrament, we that are Proteſtant and Reformed according to the ancient Catholick Church, do not ſearch into the

the manner of it with perplexing inquiries; but, after the example of the primitive and pureſt Church of Chriſt, we leave it to the power and wiſdom of our Lord, yielding a full and unfeined aſſent to his words: Had the Romiſh maintainers of Tranſubſtantiation done the ſame, they would not have determined and decreed, and then impoſed as an Article of faith abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation, a manner of preſence, newly by them invented, under pain of the moſt direful Curſe, and there would have been in the Church leſs wrangling, and more peace and unity than now is.

CHAP. II.

1, 2, *and* 3, &c. *The unanimous conſent of all Proteſtants with the Church of* England, *in maintaining a real, that is, true, but not a carnal preſence of Chriſt in the Bleſſed Sacrament, proved by publick Confeſſions and the beſt of Authorities.*

1. SO then, none of the Proteſtant Churches doubt of the real (that is, true and not imaginary) Preſence of Chriſt's body and bloud in the Sacrament; and there appears no reaſon why any man ſhould ſuſpect their common Confeſſion, of either fraud or error, as though in this particular they had in the leaſt departed from the Catholick faith.

2. For it is eaſie to produce the conſent of Reformed Churches and Authors, whereby it will clearly appear (to them that are not wilfully blind) that they all zealouſly maintain and profeſs this truth, without forſaking in any wiſe the true Catholick Faith in this matter.

3. I

3. I begin with the *Church of England*; wherein they that are in holy Orders are bound by a Law and Canon, *Never to teach any thing to the people to be by them believed in matters of Religion, but what agrees with the Doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and what the Catholick Fathers and Ancient Prelates have gathered and inferred out of it: Under pain of Excommunication if they transgress, troubling the people with contrary Doctrine.* It teacheth therefore, *that in the Blessed Sacrament, the body of Christ is given, taken and eaten; so that to the worthy Receivers, the consecrated and broken bread is the communication of the body of Christ, and likewise the consecrated Cup the communication of his bloud: But that the wicked, and they that approach unworthily the Sacrament of so sacred a thing, eat and drink their own damnation, in that they become guilty of the body and bloud of Christ.* And the same Church in a solemn Prayer, before the consecration prays thus; *Grant us, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his bloud, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious bloud, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us.* The Priest also, blessing or consecrating the Bread and Wine saith thus, *Hear us O merciful Father,*

In the Book of Canons publish'd by authority, *anno* 1571. ch. of preach.

Artic. of Relig. 1562.

Comm. Service.

we moſt humbly beſeech thee, and grant that we receiving theſe thy Creatures of Bread and Wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt's holy inſtitution, in remembrance of his Death and Paſſion, may be partakers of his moſt bleſſed body and bloud: Who in the ſame night that he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his Diſciples, ſaying, take, eat, this is my body which is given for you, do this in remembrance of me. Likewiſe after Supper he took the Cup, and when he had given thinks he gave it to them, ſaying, drink ye all of this, for this is my bloud of the New Teſtament, which is ſhed for you, and for many for the remiſſion of ſins: Do this as oft as ye ſhall drink it in remembrance of me. The ſame, when he gives the Sacrament to the people kneeling, giving the bread, ſaith; *The body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt which was given for thee, preſerve thy body and ſoul unto everlaſting life.* Likewiſe when he gives the Cup, he ſaith, *The bloud of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt which was ſhed for thee, preſerve thy body and ſoul to everlaſting life.* Afterwards, when the Communion is done, follows a thankſgiving; *Almighty and everliving God, we moſt heartily thank thee, for that thou doſt vouchſafe to feed us, who have duly received theſe holy Myſteries, with the ſpiritual food of the moſt*

Ibid.

precious

precious body and bloud of thy Son our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt; With the Hymn, *Glory be to God on high*, &c. Alſo in the publick Authorized Catechiſm of our Church, appointed to be learned of all, it is anſwered to the queſtion concerning the inward part of the Sacrament, that *it is the body and bloud of Chriſt which are verily and indeed taken and received by the Faithful in the Lords Supper.* And in the Apology for this Church, writ by that worthy and Reverend Prelate *Jewel* Biſhop of *Salisbury*, it is expreſly affirmed, *That to the faithful, is truly given in the Sacrament, the body and bloud of our Lord, the life-giving fleſh of the Son of God which quickens our ſouls, the bread that came from heaven, the food of immortality, grace and truth, and life: And that it is the Communion of the body and bloud of Chriſt, that we may abide in him, and he in us; and that we may be aſcertained that the fleſh and bloud of Chriſt is the food of our ſouls, as bread and wine is of our bodies.* Church Catech.

4. A while before the writing of this Apology, came forth the Dialectick of the famous Dr. *Poinet* Biſhop of *Wincheſter*; concerning the truth, nature, and ſubſtance of the body and bloud of Chriſt in the bleſſed Sacrament, writ on purpoſe to explain and manifeſt the Faith and Doctrine

Doctrine of the Church of *England* in that point. In the firſt place it ſhews, *that the holy Euchariſt is not only the figure, but alſo contains in it ſelf the truth, nature, and ſubſtance of the body of our bleſſed Saviour; and that thoſe words, nature and ſubſtance ought not to be rejected, becauſe the Fathers uſed them in ſpeaking of that Myſtery.* Secondly, He inquires whether thoſe expreſſions, truth, nature, and ſubſtance *were uſed in this Myſtery by the Ancients, in their common acceptation, or in a ſenſe more particular and proper to the Sacraments? Becauſe we muſt not only obſerve what words they uſed, but alſo what they meant to ſignifie and to teach by them.* And though with the Fathers he acknowledged a difference, betwixt the body of Chriſt in its natural form of a humane body, and that Myſtick body preſent in the Sacrament, yet he choſe rather to put that difference *in the manner of preſence and exhibition*, than *in the ſubject it ſelf, that is, the real body and bloud of our Saviour*; being it is moſt certain, that no other body is given to the faithful in the Sacrament than that which was by Chriſt given to death for their Redemption. Laſtly, he affirms, *according to the unanimous conſent of the Fathers, that this matter muſt be underſtood in a ſpiritual ſenſe, baniſhing all groſſer and more carnal thoughts.*

5. To

5. To Biſhop *Poinet* ſucceeded in the ſame See the right Reverend Doctors *T. Bilſon* and *L. Andrews*, Prelates both of them, throughly learned, and great defenders of the Primitive Faith, who made it moſt evident by their Printed Writings, that the Faith and Doctrine of the Church of *England* is in all things agreeable to the holy Scriptures, and the Divinity of the Ancient Fathers. And as to what regards this Myſtery, the (*a*) firſt treats of it, in his Anſwer to the Apology of Cardinal *Alan*, and the (*b*) laſt in his Anſwer to the Apology of Cardinal *Bellarmine*, where you may find things worthy to be read and noted as follows. *Chriſt ſaid, this is my body; in this, the object, we are agreed with you, the manner only is controverted. We hold by a firm belief that it is the body of Chriſt, of the manner how it comes to be ſo there is not a word in the Goſpel; and becauſe the Scripture is ſilent in this, we juſtly diſown it to be a matter of Faith: We may indeed rank it among Tenets of the School, but by no means, among the Articles of our Chriſtian Belief. We like well of what* Durandus *is reported to have ſaid,* [*We hear the Word, and feel the motion, we know not the manner, and yet believe the Preſence:*] *For we believe a Real Preſence no leſs than you do. We dare not be*

a *Bilſ. reſp. ad Card. Alan. l. 4.*
b *Andr. reſp. ad Apol Bel. c. 11. p. 11*

be ſo bold as preſumptuouſly to define any thing concerning the manner of a true Preſence, or rather, we do not ſo much as trouble our ſelves with being inquiſitive about it; no more than in Baptiſm, how the bloud of Chriſt waſheth us; or in the Incarnation of our Redeemer, how the Divine and Humane Nature were united together. We put it in the number of ſacred things or Sacrifices, (the Euchariſt it ſelf being a Sacred Myſtery) whereof the remnants ought to be conſumed with fire, that is, (as the Fathers elegantly have it) ador'd by faith, but not ſearcht by reaſon.

Cauſ. Ep. to Card. Perron.

6. To the ſame ſenſe ſpeaks *Iſ. Cauſabon*, in the Epiſtle he wrote by order from King *James* to Cardinal *Perron*; ſo doth alſo *Hooker* in his *Eccleſiaſtical Polity*, Book 5. §. 67. *John Biſhop of Rocheſter* in his Book, of *the Power of the Pope*; *R. Mountague* Biſhop of *Norwich* againſt *Bullinger*; *James* Primate of *Armach* in his Anſwer to the *Iriſh Jeſuit*; *Francis* Biſhop of *Eli*, and *William Laud* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, in their Anſwer to *Fiſher*; (c) *John Overall* Biſhop of *Norwich*, and many others in the Church of *England*, who never departed from the Faith and Doctrine of the ancient Catholick Fathers, which is by Law eſtabliſhed, and with great care and veneration received and preſerved in our Church.

Ep. Roff. præf. ad lect. Montac. in Antid. Art. 13.

c In a Manuſcript ſhortly to be Printed.

7. To

7. To theſe alſo we may juſtly add that famous Prelate *Antonius de Domino Archbiſhop of Spalato*, a man well verſed in the Sacred Writings, and the Records of Antiquity; who having left *Italy* (when he could no longer remain in it, either with quiet or ſafety) by the advice of his intimate Friend *Paulus Venetus*, took Sanctuary under the protection of King *James* of bleſſed memory, in the boſome of the Church of *England*, which he did faithfully follow in all Points and Articles of Religion: But being daily vex'd with many affronts and injuries, and wearied by the unjuſt perſecutions of ſome ſour and over-rigid men, who bitterly declaimed every where againſt his life and actions, he at laſt reſolved to return into *Italy* with a ſafe conduct. Before he departed, he was, by order from the King, queſtioned by ſome Commiſſionated Biſhops what he thought of the Religion and Church of *England*, which for ſo many years he had owned and obeyed, and what he would ſay of it in the *Roman* Court: to this Query he gave in writing this memorable anſwer, *I am reſolved, even with the danger of my life, to profeſs before the Pope himſelf, that the Church of* England *is a true and Orthodox Church of Chriſt.*

Christ. This he not only promiſed but faithfully performed, for though, ſoon after his departure, there came a Book out of the *Low Countries*, falſly bearing his name, by whoſe title many were deceived even among the Engliſh, and thereby moved to tax him with Apoſtacy, and of being another *Eubolius*; yet when he came to *Rome* (where he was moſt kindly entertained in the Palace of Pope *Gregory the Fifteenth*, who formerly had been his Fellow-ſtudent) he could never be perſwaded by the *Jeſuits* and others who daily thronged upon him, neither to ſubſcribe the new-deviſed-Tenets of the Council of *Trent*, or to retract thoſe Orthodox Books which he had Printed in *England* and *Germany*, or to renounce the Communion of the Church of *England*, in whoſe defence he conſtantly perſiſted to the very laſt. But preſently after the deceaſe of Pope *Gregory*, he was impriſoned by the *Jeſuits* and *Inquiſitors* in *Caſtle St. Angelo*, where, by being barbarouſly uſed, and almoſt ſtarved, he ſoon got a mortal ſickneſs, and died in a few days, though not without ſuſpicion of being poyſoned. The day following his Corps was, by the ſentence of the *Inquiſition*, tyed to an infamous ſtake, and there burnt

burnt to aſhes; for no other reaſon, but that he refuſed to make abjuration of the Religion of the Church of *England*, and ſubſcribe ſome of the lately-made-Decrees of *Trent*, which were preſt upon him as Canons of the Catholick Faith. I have taken occaſion to inſert this narration, perhaps not known to many; to make it appear, that this Reverend Prelate, who did great ſervice to the Church of God, may juſtly (as I ſaid before) be reckoned amongſt the Writers of the Church of *England*.

Let us hear therefore what he taught and writ, when he was in *England*, in his Books *de Repub. Eccl. Lib.* 5. *Cap.* 6. *Num.* 20. *For a thouſand years together* (ſaith he) *the holy Catholick Church content with a ſober knowledge of Divine Myſteries, believed ſoberly, and ſafely did teach, that in the Sacrament duly Conſecrated, the Faithful did own, receive, and eat the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, which by the Sacred Bread and Wine are given to them, but as to the particular manner how that precious Body and Bloud is offered and given by that Myſterious Sacrament, the Church did humbly and religiouſly acknowledge her ignorance: The real thing with its effects ſhe joyfully own'd and received, but meekly and devoutly abſtained from inquiring into the manner.*

Item

Item (Numb. 73.) *the true and real Body of Chriſt is moſt certainly and undoubtedly given in the holy Sacrament, yet not carnally, but Spiritually.* Again (Numb. 169.) *I doubt not, but all they that believe the Goſpel, will acknowledge that in the holy Communion we receive the true nature of the fleſh of Chriſt, real and ſubſtantial. We all teach that the body of Chriſt is preſent as to its reality and nature, but a carnal and corporal manner of preſence we reject with St.* Bernard, *and all the Fathers.* And in *Appen. ad Ambroſium*, Numb. 7. *I know and acknowledge that with the Bread ſtill remaining bread, the true and real body of Chriſt is given, yet not corporally: I aſſent in the thing, but not in the manner. Therefore though there is a change in the Bread, when it brings into the Souls of worthy Communicants, the true body of Chriſt which is the ſubſtance of the Sacrament: Yet it doth not follow that the Bread loſeth its own, to become the ſubſtance of the body of Chriſt*, &c. Theſe, and much more to the ſame purpoſe, agreeable to the Religion and Church of *England*, and all other *Proteſtant* Churches, you may find in the ſame Chapter, and in a Treatiſe annext to the ſixth Book, againſt the famous *Jeſuit*, *Suarez*, who had writ againſt *King James*, and the Errors (as he calls them) of the Church of *England*:

In

In the ſecond Chapter our Prelate proves clearly, according to its title, *That thoſe Points which the Papiſts maintain againſt the Proteſtants belong not in any wiſe to the Catholick Faith,* (as *Tranſubſtantiation*, &c.)

8. As for the opinion and belief of the *German* Proteſtants, It will be known chiefly by the *Auguſtan* Confeſſion, preſented to *Charles the Fifth* by the Princes of the Empire and other great Perſons. For they teach, That *not only the Bread and Wine, but the Body and Bloud of Chriſt is truly given to the Receivers*; or, as it is in another Edition, That *the Body and Bloud of Chriſt are truly preſent, and diſtributed to the Communicants in the Lords Supper*, and refute thoſe that teach otherwiſe. They alſo declare, *That we muſt ſo uſe the Sacraments, as to believe and embrace by Faith thoſe things promiſed which the Sacraments offer and convey to us.* Yet we may obſerve here, that Faith makes not thoſe things preſent which are promiſed; for Faith (as it is well known) is more properly ſaid to take and apprehend, than to promiſe or perform: But the Word and Promiſe of God, on which our Faith is grounded (and not Faith it ſelf) make that preſent which is promiſed; as it was agreed at a Conference at St. *German* betwixt ſome Proteſtants

The *Auguſtan* Confeſſion of *Germ* Churches

Collat. S. Germ. 1561.

and Papiſts: And therefore it is unjuſtly laid to our charge by ſome in the Church of *Rome*, as if we ſhould believe, that the preſence and participation of Chriſt, in the Sacrament, is effected meerly by the power of Faith.

The *Saxon* Confeſſion. 9. The *Saxon* Confeſſion, approved by other Churches, ſeems to be a repetition of the *Auguſtan*: Therein we are taught, That *Sacraments are actions divinely inſtituted, and that although the ſame things or actions in common uſe have nothing of the nature of Sacraments, yet when uſed according to the divine inſtitution, Chriſt is truly and ſubſtantially preſent in the Communion, and his Body and Bloud truly given to the Receivers; ſo that he teſtifies that he is in them*; as St. *Hillary* ſaith, *Theſe things taken and received make us to be in Chriſt, and Chriſt to be in us.*

Art. 15.

Hil. Trin. l. 8.

The Confeſſion of *Wittemb.* 10. The Confeſſion of *Wittemberg*, which in the year 1552 was propounded to the Council of *Trent*, is like unto this: For it teacheth, That *the true Body and Bloud of Chriſt are given in the holy Communion*, and refutes thoſe that ſay, *That the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament are only ſigns of the abſent Body and Bloud of Chriſt.*

In the Preface.

Confeſs. *Bohem.* 11. The *Bohemian* Confeſſion alſo, that is of them who by contempt, and out of ignorance,

ignorance, are called by ſome *Picards* and *Waldenſes*, preſented to King *Ferdinand* by the Barons and Nobles of *Bohemia*, and approved by *Luther*, and *Melanćthon*, and the Famous Univerſity of *Wittemberg*, teacheth, that *we ought from the heart to believe, and to profeſs by words, that the Bread of the Lords Supper is the true Body of Chriſt whith was given for us, and the Wine, his true Bloud that was ſhed for us: And that it is not lawful for any perſon to bring or add any thing of his own to the words of Chriſt, or in the leaſt to take any thing from them.* And when this their Confeſſion was defamed and abuſed by ſome of their Adverſaries, they anſwered, That *they would ever be ready to refute the Calumniators, and to make it appear by ſtrong Arguments, and a ſtronger Faith, that they never were, and by Gods grace, never would be what their Adverſaries repreſented them.* Art. 13.

12. In the ſame manner, The Conciliation of the Articles of the Lords Supper, and the mutual agreement betwixt the Churches of the greater and leſſer *Polonia* in the Synod of *Sendomiris*, *We hold together* (ſay they) *the belief of the words of Chriſt, as they have been rightly underſtood by the Fathers; or to ſpeak more plain, We believe and confeſs, that the ſubſtantial Preſence* *Conſenſus Polonicus.* Near the begining.

of Chriſt is not only ſignified in the Lords Supper, but alſo that the Body and Bloud of our Lord is truly offered and granted to worthy Receivers, together with thoſe ſacred ſigns which convey to us the thing ſignified, according to the nature of Sacraments, and leſt the different ways of ſpeaking ſhould breed any contention, we mutually conſent to ſubſcribe that Article concerning the Lords Supper which is in the Confeſſion of the Churches of Saxony, *which they ſent to the Council of* Trent; *and we hold and acknowledge it to be ſound and pious.* Then they repeat the whole Article, mentioned and ſet down a little before.

Confeſſio Theol. Argent. & Baſil.

13. *Luther* was once of opinion that the Divines of *Baſil* and *Strasbourg* did acknowledge nothing in the Lords Supper beſides Bread and Wine. To him *Bucerus*, in the name of all the reſt, did freely anſwer, *That they all unanimouſly did condemn that error; that neither they, nor the* Switzers *ever believed or taught any ſuch thing; that none could expreſly be charged with that Error, except the* Anabaptiſts: *And that he alſo had once been perſwaded, that* Luther *in his Writings attributed too much to the outward Symbols, and maintained a groſſer Union of Chriſt with the Bread than the Scriptures did allow; as though Chriſt had been corporally preſent with it, united into a natural ſubſtance with the Bread;*

Bread; ſo that the wicked as well as the faithful were made partakers of grace by receiving the Element: But that their own Doctrine and belief concerning that Sacrament was, that the true Body and Bloud of Chriſt was truly preſented, given, and received together with the viſible ſigns of Bread and Wine, by the operation of our Lord, and by vertue of his inſtitution, according to the plain ſound and ſenſe of his words; and that not only Zuinglius *and* Oecolampadius *had ſo taught, but they alſo, in the publick Confeſſions of the Churches of the Upper* Germany, *and other Writings, confeſt it; ſo that the Controverſie was rather about the manner of the preſence or abſence, than about the preſence or abſence it ſelf;* All which *Bucer's* Aſſociates confirm after him. He alſo adds, *That the Magiſtrates in their Churches had denounced very ſevere puniſhments to any that ſhould deny the preſence of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt in the Lords Supper. Bucerus* did alſo maintain this Doctrine of the bleſſed Sacrament in preſence of the *Landgrave of Heſſe* and *Melanchthon*, confeſſing, *That together with the Sacrament we truly and ſubſtantially receive the body of Chriſt.* Alſo, *That the Bread and Wine are conferring ſigns, giving what they repreſent, ſo that together with them the Body of Chriſt is given and received.* And to theſe he adds, *That*

the Body and Bread are not united in the mixture of their ſubſtance, but in that the Sacrament gives what it promiſeth, that is, the one is never without the other; and ſo they agreeing on both parts, that the Bread and Wine are not changed, he holds ſuch a Sacramental Union. *Luther* having heard this, declared alſo his opinion thus, *That he did not locally include the Body and Bloud of Chriſt with the Bread and Wine, and unite them together by any natural connexion; and that he did not make proper to the Sacraments that vertue whereby they brought Salvation to the Receivers; but that he maintained only a Sacramental Union betwixt the Body of Chriſt and the Bread, and betwixt his Bloud and the Wine; and did teach, that the power of confirming our Faith, which he attributed to the Sacraments, was not naturally inherent in the outward ſigns, but proceeded from the operation of Chriſt, and was given by his Spirit, by his Words, and by the Elements.* And finally, in this manner he ſpake to all that were preſent; *If you believe and teach that in the Lords Supper the true Body and Bloud of Chriſt is given and received, and not the Bread and Wine only; and that this giving and receiving is real and not imaginary, we are agreed, and we own you for dear Brethren in the Lord.* All this is ſet down at large in the twentieth

Tome

Tome of *Luthers* Works, and in the Engliſh Works of *Bucer*.

14. The next will be the *Gallican* Confeſſion, made at *Paris* in a National Synod, and preſented to King *Charles* IX. at the Conference of *Poiſſy*. Which ſpeaks of the Sacrament on this wiſe: *Although Chriſt be in heaven, where he is to remain until he come to judge the World, yet we believe that by the ſecret and incomprehenſible virtue of his Spirit, he feeds and viviſies us by the ſubſtance of his Body and Bloud received by Faith: now we ſay that this is done in a ſpiritual manner; not that we believe it to be a fancy and imagination, inſtead of a truth and real effect, but rather becauſe that Myſtery of our Union with Chriſt is of ſo ſublime a nature, that it is as much above the capacity of our ſenſes, as it is above the order of nature.* Item, *We believe that in the Lords Supper God gives us really, that is, truly, and efficaciouſly, whatever is repreſented by the Sacrament, with the ſigns we joyn the true Poſſeſſion and fruition of the thing by them offered to us: And ſo, that Bread and Wine which are given to us, become our ſpiritual nouriſhment, in that they make it in ſome manner viſible to us that the Fleſh of Chriſt is our food, and his Bloud our drink. Therefore thoſe Fanaticks that reject theſe Signs and Symbols are by us rejected, our bleſſed* The *French* Confeſſ. Art. 36.

Saviour having ſaid, This is my body, and this Cup is my bloud. This Confeſſion hath been ſubſcribed by the Church of *Geneva*.

Legat. Eccl. Gall. conf. 1555

15. The Envoyes from the *French* Churches to *Worms* made a declaration concerning that Myſtery, much after the ſame manner: *We confeſs* (ſay they) *that in the Lords Supper, beſides the benefits of Chriſt, the ſubſtance alſo of the Son of man, his true body, with his bloud ſhed for us, are not only figuratively ſignified by Types and Symbols, as memorials of things abſent; but alſo, truly and certainly preſented, given, and offered to be applied, by ſigns that are not bare and deſtitute, but (on Gods part, in regard of his offer and promiſe) always undoubtedly accompanied with what they ſignifie, whether they be offered to good or bad Chriſtians.*

Belg. Conf. Art. 35.

16. Now follows the *Belgick* Confeſſion, which profeſſeth it *to be moſt certain, that Chriſt doth really effect in us what is figured by the ſigns, although it be above the capacity of our reaſon to underſtand which way; the operations of the Holy Ghoſt being always occult and incomprehenſible.*

Helvet. Confeſſ. prior. Ch. 21.

17. The more ancient Confeſſion of the *Switzers*, made by common conſent at *Baſil*, and approved by all the *Helvetick*-Proteſtant Churches, hath it, That *while the Faithful eat the bread, and drink the cup of*

the

the Lord, they, by the operation of Chriſt working by the Holy Spirit, receive the Body and Bloud of our Lord, and thereby are fed unto Eternal life. But notwithſtanding that, they affirm, that this food is ſpiritual, yet they afterwards conclude; *That by ſpiritual food they underſtand not imaginary, but the very body of Chriſt which was given for us.*

18. And the latter Confeſſion of the *Switzers*, writ and Printed in 1566. affirms as expreſly the true preſence of Chriſts body in the Euchariſt, thus: *Outwardly the bread is offered by the Miniſter, and the words of Chriſt heard, Take, eat, this is my Body, drink ye all of this, this is my Bloud. Therefore the Faithful receive what Chriſts Miniſter gives, and drink of the Lords Cup: And at the ſame time, by the power of Chriſt working by the Holy Ghoſt, are fed by the fleſh and bloud of our Lord unto eternal life,* &c. Again, *Chriſt is not abſent from his Church celebrating his holy Supper. The Sun in heaven, being diſtant from us, is nevertheleſs preſent by his efficacy; how much more ſhall Chriſt the Sun of righteouſneſs, who is bodily in heaven, abſent from us, be ſpiritually preſent to us by his life-giving virtue, and as he declared in his laſt Supper he would be preſent,* Joh. 14. 15, 16. *Whence it follows that we have no Communion without* *Helvet. Conf. poſterior.*

without Christ. Now to this Confession, not only the Reformed *Switzers* did subscribe, but also the Churches of *Hungary*, *Pannonia*, or *Transilvania*, *Poland*, and *Lithuania*, which follow neither the *Augustan* nor *Bohemian* Confessions: It was subscribed also by the Churches of *Scotland* and *Geneva*.

Conf. *Thorun.*

19. Lastly, Let us hear the renowned Declaration of the Reformed Churches of *Poland*, made in the Assembly of *Thoran*, whereby they profess, that as to what concerns the Sacrament of the Eucharist, *they assent to that opinion which in the* Augustan *Confession, in the* Bohemian, *and that of* Sendom. *is confirmed by Scripture.* Then afterwards in another Declaration they explain their own Mind, thus saying: 1. *That the Sacrament consisteth of earthly things, as Bread and Wine; and things heavenly, as the Body and Bloud of our Lord; both of which, though in a different manner, yet most truly and really, are given together at the same time; earthly things, in an earthly, corporal, and natural way; heavenly things, in a mystick, spiritual, and heavenly manner.* 2. Hence they infer, *That the Bread and Wine are, and are said to be, with truth, the very Body and Bloud of Christ; not substantially indeed, that is, not corporally, but Sacramentally*

mentally and Myſtically, by vertue of the Sacramental Union; which conſiſteth not in a bare ſignification or obligation only, but alſo in a real exhibition and communication of both parts, earthly and heavenly, together at once, though in a different manner. 3. In that ſenſe they affirm with the Ancients, *That the Bread and Wine are changed into the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, not in nature and ſubſtance, but in uſe and efficacy; in which reſpect the ſacred Elements are not called what they are to ſenſe, but what they are believed and received by faith grounded on the Promiſe.* 4. They deny *to believe the ſigns to be bare, inefficacious, and empty, but rather ſuch as truly give what they ſeal and ſignifie, being efficacious inſtruments and moſt certain means whereby the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, and ſo, Chriſt himſelf with all his benefits, is ſet forth and offered to all Communicants, but conferred and given to true Believers, and by them received as the ſaving and vivifying food of their Souls.* 5. They deny not *the true preſence of the body and bloud of Chriſt in the Lords Supper, but only the Corporal manner of his Preſence.* They believe *a Myſtical Union betwixt Chriſt and us, and that, not imaginary, but moſt true, real, and efficacious.* 6. Thence they conclude, *That not only the vertue, efficacy, operation, or benefits of Chriſt are communicated to us, but more*

eſpecially

eſpecially the very ſubſtance of his Body and Bloud, ſo that, he abides in us, and we in him.

20. Now becauſe great is the fame of *Calvin* (who ſubſcribed the *Auguſtan* Confeſſion, and that of the *Switzers*) let us hear what he writ and believed concerning this ſacred Myſtery: His words in his Inſtitutions and elſewhere are ſuch, ſo conformable to the ſtile and mind of the Ancient Fathers, that no Catholick Proteſtant would wiſh to uſe any other. *I underſtand* (ſaith he) *what is to be underſtood by the words of Chriſt; that he doth not only offer us the benefits of his Death and Reſurrection, but his very body, wherein he died and roſe again. I aſſert that the body of Chriſt is really (as the uſual expreſſion is) that is, truly given to us in the Sacrament, to be the ſaving food of our ſouls.* Alſo in another place, Item, *That word cannot lie, neither can it mock us; and except one preſumes to call God a deceiver he will never dare to ſay, that the Symbols are empty, and that Chriſt is not in them. Therefore if by the breaking of the bread our Saviour doth repreſent the participation of his body, it is not to be doubted but that he truly gives and confers it. If it be true that the viſible ſign is given us, to ſeal the gift of an inviſible thing, we muſt firmly believe, that receiving*

Comm. on 1 Cor.

Inſtit. Book 4. Ch. 17.

receiving the ſigns of the body, we alſo certainly receive the body it ſelf. Setting aſide all abſurdities, I do willingly admit all thoſe terms that can moſt ſtrongly expreſs the true and ſubſtantial Communication of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, granted to the Faithful with the Symbols of the Lords Supper; and that, not as if they received only by the force of their imagination, or an act of their minds, but really, ſo as to be fed thereby unto Eternal life. Again, *We muſt therefore confeſs that the inward ſubſtance of the Sacrament is joyned with the viſible ſign, ſo that, as the Bread is put into our hand, the Body of Chriſt is alſo given to us. This certainly, if there were nothing elſe, ſhould abundantly ſatisfie us, that we underſtand, that Chriſt, in his Holy Supper, gives us the true and proper ſubſtance of his Body and Bloud, that it being wholly ours, we may be made partakers of all his benefits and graces.* Again, *The Son of God offers daily to us in the holy Sacrament, the ſame body which he once offered in ſacrifice to his Father, that it may be our ſpiritual food.* In theſe he aſſerts, as clearly as any one can, the true, *Real*, and ſubſtantial Preſence and Communication of the Body of Chriſt, but how, he undertakes not to determine. *If any one* (ſaith he) *ask me concerning the manner, I will not be aſhamed to confeſs that it is a ſecret*

Treat. of the Lords Supper.

Inſt. B. 4. Ch. 17. Num. 32.

too

too high for my reaſon to comprehend, or my tongue to expreſs; or to ſpeak more properly, I rather feel than underſtand it: Therefore without diſputing I embrace the truth of God, and confidently repoſe on it. He declares that his Fleſh is the food, and his Bloud the drink of my Soul: And my Soul I offer to him to be fed by ſuch nouriſhment. He bids me take, eat, and drink his Body and Bloud, which in his holy Supper he offers me under the Symbols of Bread and Wine: I make no ſcruple, but he doth reach them to me, and I receive them. All theſe are *Calvins* own words.

21. I was the more willing to be long in tranſcribing theſe things at large, out of publick Confeſſions of Churches, and the beſt of Authors; that it might the better appear, how injuriouſly Proteſtant Divines are calumniated by others unacquainted with their opinions, as though by theſe words, *Spiritually* and *Sacramentally*, they did not acknowledge a true and well-underſtood-*real* Preſence and Communication of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt in the Bleſſed Sacrament; whereas on the contrary, they do profeſſedly own it, in terms as expreſs as any can be uſed.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

1. *What the Papiſts do underſtand by Chriſt being ſpiritually preſent in the Sacrament.* 2. *What St.* Bernard *underſtood by it.* 3. *What the Proteſtants.* 4. *Faith doth not cauſe, but ſuppoſe the preſence of Chriſt.* 5. *The Union betwixt the Body of Chriſt and the Bread is Sacramental.*

1. HAving now, by what I have ſaid, put it out of doubt, that the Proteſtants believe a *ſpiritual* and *true* preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament, which is the reaſon, that according to the example of the Fathers, they uſe ſo frequently the term *ſpiritual* in this ſubject; it may not be amiſs to conſider in the next place, how the *Roman* Church underſtands that ſame word. Now they make it to ſignifie, *That Chriſt is not preſent in the Sacrament, either after that manner which is natural to corporal things, or that wherein his own body ſubſiſts in heaven, but according to the manner* Bell. de Euch l. 1. c. 2. §. 3. Reg. & ſequ.

of

of Exiſtence proper to Spirits, whole and entire in each part of the Hoſt: And though by himſelf he be neither ſeen, toucht, nor moved, yet in reſpect of the Species or accidents joyned with him, he may be ſaid to be ſeen, toucht, and moved: Ibid. Part. 1. *And ſo the accidents being moved, the body of Chriſt is truly moved accidentally, as the Soul truly changeth place with the Body; ſo that we truly and properly ſay that the body of Chriſt is removed, lifted up, and ſet down, put on the Patent, or on the Altar, and carried from hand to mouth, and from the mouth to the ſtomach;* Ibid. § 5. Reg. *as* Berengarius *was forced to acknowledge in the Roman Council under Pope* Nicholas, *that the Body of Chriſt was ſenſually toucht by the hands, and broken and chewed by the teeth of the Prieſt.* But all this, and much more to the ſame effect, was never delivered to us, either by holy Scripture, or the ancient Fathers. And if Souls or Spirits could be preſent, as here *Bellarmine* teacheth, yet it would be abſurd to ſay that bodies could be ſo likewiſe, it being inconſiſtent with their nature.

2. Indeed *Bellarmine* confeſſeth with St. *Bernard*, That *Chriſt in the Sacrament is not given to us carnally, but ſpiritually*; and would to God he had reſted here, and not outgone the *holy Scriptures*, and the Doctrine of the *Fathers*. For endeavouring, with

St. Bern. Serm de S. Martin.

with *Pope Innocent* III. and the Council of *Trent*, to determine the manner of the preſence and Manducation of Chriſts body, with more nicety than was fitting, he thereby fooliſhly overthrew all that he had wiſely ſaid before, denied what he had affirmed, and oppoſed his own Opinion. *His fear was leſt his Adverſaries ſhould apply that word* ſpiritually, *not ſo much to expreſs the manner of preſence, as to exclude the very ſubſtance of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt; therefore* (ſaith he) *upon that account it is not ſafe to uſe too much that of St.* Bernard, *The body of Chriſt is not Corporally in the Sacrament, without adding preſently the above-mentioned explanation.* How much do we comply with humane pride, and curioſity, which would ſeem to underſtand all things! Where is the danger? And what doth he fear, as long as all they that believe the Goſpel, own the true nature, & the real and ſubſtantial preſence of the body of Chriſt in the Sacrament, uſing that Explication of St. *Bernard* concerning the manner, which he himſelf, for the too great evidence of truth, durſt not but admit? And why doth he own that the manner is ſpiritual, not carnal, and then require a carnal preſence, as to the manner it ſelf? As for us, we all openly profeſs with St. *Ber-*

nard, that the preſence of the body of Chriſt in the Sacrament, is ſpiritual, and therefore true and real; and with the ſame *Bernard*, and all the Ancients, we deny that the Body of Chriſt is carnally either preſent or given. The thing we willingly admit, but humbly and religiouſly forbear to enquire into the manner.

3. We believe a Preſence and Union of Chriſt with our ſoul and body, which we know not how to call better than Sacramental, that is, effected by eating; that while we eat and drink the conſecrated Bread and Wine, we eat and drink therewithal the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, not in a corporal manner, but ſome other way, incomprehenſible, known only to God, which we call ſpiritual; for if with St. *Bernard* and the Fathers a man goes no further, we do not find fault with a general explication of the manner, but with the preſumption and ſelf-conceitedneſs of thoſe who boldly and curiouſly inquire what is a ſpiritual preſence, as preſuming that they can underſtand the manner of acting of Gods holy Spirit. We contrariwiſe confeſs with the Fathers, that this manner of preſence is unaccountable, and paſt finding out, not to be ſearcht and pried

pried into by Reaſon, but believed by Faith. And if it ſeems impoſſible that the fleſh of Chriſt ſhould deſcend, and come to be our food, through ſo great a diſtance; we muſt remember how much the power of the holy Spirit exceeds our ſenſe and our apprehenſions, and how abſurd it would be to undertake to meaſure his Immenſity by our weakneſs and narrow capacity; and ſo make our Faith to conceive and believe what our Reaſon cannot comprehend.

4. Yet our Faith doth not cauſe or make that Preſence, but apprehends it as moſt truly and really effected by the word of Chriſt: And the Faith whereby we are ſaid to eat the fleſh of Chriſt, is not that only whereby we believe that he died for our ſins (for this Faith is required and ſuppoſed to precede the Sacramental Manducation) but more properly, that whereby we believe thoſe words of Chriſt, *This is my Body*; which was St. *Auſtins* meaning when he ſaid, *Why doſt thou prepare thy ſtomach and thy teeth? Believe and thou haſt eaten.* For in this Myſtical eating by the wonderful power of the Holy Ghoſt, we do inviſibly receive the ſubſtance of Chriſts Body and Bloud, as much as if we ſhould eat and drink both viſibly.

Aug. ſuper Joh. Tract. 25.

5. The result of all this is, That the Body and Bloud of Christ are Sacramentally united to the Bread and Wine, so that Christ is truly given to the Faithful; and yet is not to be here considered with sense or worldly reason, but by Faith, resting on the words of the Gospel. Now it is said, that the Body and Bloud of Christ are joyned to the Bread and Wine, because, that in the celebration of the holy Eucharist, the Flesh is given together with the Bread, and the Bloud together with the Wine. All that remains is, That we should with faith and humility admire this high and sacred Mystery, which our tongue cannot sufficiently explain, nor our heart conceive.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

1. *Of the change of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, which the Papiſts call* Tranſubſtantiation. 2. *Of Gods Omnipotency.* 3. *Of the Accidents of the Bread.* 4. *The Sacramental Union of the thing ſignified with the ſign.* 5 *and* 6. *The queſtion is ſtated Negatively and Affirmatively.* 7. *The definition of the Council of* Trent. *The Bull of Pope* Pius IV. *and the form of the Oath by him appointed. The Decretal of* Innocent III. *The Aſſertions of the* Jeſuits. 8. Tranſubſtantiation *a very monſtrous thing.*

1. IT is an Article of faith in the Church of *Rome*, that in the Bleſſed Euchariſt the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine is reduced to nothing, and that in its place ſucceeds the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, as we ſhall ſee more at large § 6, and 7.

and 7. The Proteſtants are much of another mind; and yet none of them denies altogether but that there is a converſion of the Bread into the Body (and conſequently of the Wine into the Bloud) of Chriſt: For they know and acknowledge that in the Sacrament, by vertue of the words and bleſſing of Chriſt, the condition, uſe, and office of the Bread is wholly changed, that is, of common and ordinary, it becomes our Myſtical and Sacramental food; whereby, as they affirm and believe, the true Body of Chriſt is not only ſhadowed and figured, but alſo given indeed, and by worthy Communicants truly received. Yet they believe not that the bread loſeth its own, to become the ſubſtance of the Body of Chriſt; for the holy Scripture, and the ancient Interpreters thereof for many ages, never taught ſuch an Eſſential change and converſion, as that the very ſubſtance, the matter and form of the Bread ſhould be wholly taken away, but only a myſterious and Sacramental one, whereby our Ordinary is changed into Myſtick bread, and thereby deſigned and appointed to another uſe, end, and office than before? This change, whereby ſupernatural effects are wrought by things natural, while their

Eſſence

Eſſence is preſerved entire, doth beſt agree with the grace and power of God.

2. There is no reaſon why we ſhould diſpute concerning Gods Omnipotency, whether it can do this or that, preſuming to meaſure an infinite power by our poor ability which is but weakneſs. We may grant that he is able to do beyond what we can think or apprehend, and reſolve his moſt wonderful acts into his abſolute will and power, but we may not charge him with working contradictions. And though Gods Almightineſs were able in this Myſtery to deſtroy the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, and eſſentially to change it into the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, while the accidents of Bread and Wine ſubſiſt of themſelves without a ſubject, yet we deſire to have it proved that God will have it ſo, and that it is ſo indeed. For, that God doth it becauſe he can, is no Argument; and that he wills it, we have no other proof but the confident Aſſertion of our Adverſaries. *Tertullian* againſt *Praxias* declared, *That we ſhould not conclude God doth things becauſe he is able, but that we ſhould enquire what he hath done*; For God will never own that praiſe of his Omnipotency, whereby his unchange-

ableneſs and his truth are impaired, and thoſe things overthrown and deſtroy'd, which, in his word, he affirms to be; for, take away the Bread and Wine, and there remains no Sacrament.

3. They that ſay, that the matter and form of the Bread are wholly aboliſhed, yet will have the accidents to remain: But if the ſubſtance of the Bread be changed into the ſubſtance of Chriſts Body, by vertue of his words, what hinders that the accidents of the Bread are not alſo changed into the accidents of Chriſts Body? They that urge the expreſs Letter, ſhould ſhew that Chriſt ſaid, This is the ſubſtance of my Body without its accidents. But he did not ſay, That he gave his Diſciples a Phantaſtick Body, ſuch a viſionary figment as *Marcion* believed, but that very Body which was given for us, without being deprived of that extention and other accidents of humane bodies without which it could not have been crucified, ſince the Maintainers of Tranſubſtantiation grant that the Body of Chriſt keeps its quantity in Heaven, and ſay it is without the ſame in the Sacrament; they muſt either acknowledge their contradiction in the matter, or give over their opinion.

4. Proteſtants

4. Proteſtants dare not be ſo curious, or preſume to know more than is delivered by Scripture and Antiquity, they firmly believing the words of Chriſt, make the form of this Sacrament to conſiſt in the Union of the thing ſignified with the ſign, that is, the exhibition of the Body of Chriſt with the conſecrated bread, ſtill remaining bread; by divine appointment theſe two are made one; and though this Union be not natural, ſubſtantial, perſonal, or local by their being one within another, yet it is ſo ſtraight and ſo true, that in eating the bleſſed Bread, the true body of Chriſt is given to us, and the names of the ſign and thing ſignified are reciprocally changed, what is proper to the body is attributed to the bread, and what belongs only to the bread, is affirmed of the body, and both are united in time, though not in place. For the preſence of Chriſt in this Myſtery is not oppoſed to diſtance but to abſence, which only could deprive us of the benefit and fruition of the object.

5. From what hath been ſaid it appears, that this whole controverſie may be reduced to four Heads; 1. Concerning the Signs; 2. Concerning the thing ſignified; 3. Concerning

3. Concerning the Union of both; and 4. Concerning their participation; As for the firſt, The Proteſtants differ from the Papiſts in this, that according to the nature of Sacraments, and the Doctrine of holy Scripture we make the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, and they accidents only to be ſigns. In the ſecond, they not underſtanding our opinion do miſrepreſent it, for we do not hold (as they ſay we do) that only the merits of the Death of Chriſt are repreſented by the bleſſed Elements, but alſo that his very Body which was crucified, and his Bloud which was ſhed for us, are truly ſignified and offered, that our Souls may receive and poſſeſs Chriſt, as truly and certainly as the material and viſible ſigns are by us ſeen and received. And ſo in the third place, becauſe the thing ſignified is offered and given to us, as truly as the ſign it ſelf, in this reſpect we own the Union betwixt the Body and bloud of Chriſt, and the Elements, whoſe uſe and office we hold to be changed from what it was before. But we deny what the Papiſts affirm, that the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine are quite aboliſhed, and changed into the Body and Bloud of our Lord in ſuch ſort, that the bare accidents

of

of the Elements do alone remain united with Chriſts Body and Bloud. And we alſo deny that the Elements ſtill retain the nature of Sacraments when not uſed according to divine inſtitution, that is, given by Chriſts Miniſters, and received by his People; ſo that Chriſt in the conſecrated bread ought not, cannot be kept and preſerved to be carried about, becauſe he is preſent only to the Communicants. As for the fourth and laſt point, we do not ſay, that in the Lords Supper we receive only the benefits of Chriſts Death and Paſſion, but we joyn the ground with its fruits, that is, Chriſt with thoſe advantages we receive from him, affirming with St. *Paul*, *That the bread which we break is κοινωνία, the Communion of the body of Chriſt, and the Cup which we bleſs, the Communion of his bloud*; of that very ſubſtance which he took of the bleſſed Virgin, and afterwards carried into heaven; differing from thoſe of *Rome* only in this, that they will have our Union with Chriſt to be corporal, and our eating of him likewiſe, and we on the contrary maintain it to be, indeed as true, but not carnal or natural. And as he that receives unworthily, (that is, with the mouth only, but not with a faithful heart) eats and drinks his own damnation,

1 Cor. 10. 16.

damnation, ſo he that doth it worthily, receives his Abſolution and Juſtification; that is, he that *diſcerns*, and then receives the Lords Body as torn, and his Bloud as ſhed for the redemption of the world. But that Chriſt (as the Papiſts affirm) ſhould give his fleſh and bloud to be received with the mouth, and ground with the teeth, ſo that not only the moſt wicked and Infidels, but even Rats and Mice ſhould ſwallow him down, this our words and our hearts do utterly deny.

6. So then, (to ſum up this Controverſie by applying to it all that hath been ſaid) It is not queſtioned whether the Body of Chriſt be abſent from the Sacrament duly adminiſtred according to his Inſtitution, which we Proteſtants neither affirm nor believe: For it being given and received in the Communion, it muſt needs be that it is preſent, though in ſome manner veiled under the Sacrament, ſo that of it ſelf it cannot be ſeen. Neither is it doubted or diſputed whether the Bread and Wine, by the power of God and a ſupernatural vertue, be ſet apart and fitted for a much nobler uſe, and raiſed to a higher dignity than their nature bears; for we confeſs the neceſſity of a ſupernatural and heavenly change, and that the

the ſigns cannot become Sacraments but by the infinite power of God, whoſe proper right it is to inſtitute Sacraments in his Church, being able alone to endue them with vertue and efficacy. Finally, we do not ſay that our bleſſed Saviour gave only the figure and ſign of his body; neither do we deny a Sacramental Union of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt with the ſacred Bread and Wine, ſo that both are really and ſubſtantially received together: But (that we may avoid all ambiguity) we deny that after the words and prayer of Conſecration, the bread ſhould remain bread no longer, but ſhould be changed into the ſubſtance of the Body of Chriſt, nothing of the Bread but only the accidents continuing to be what they were before: And ſo the whole queſtion is concerning the Tranſubſtantiation of the outward Elements; whether the ſubſtance of the Bread be turned into the ſubſtance of Chriſts Body, and the ſubſtance of the Wine into the ſubſtance of his Bloud; or as the *Romiſh* Doctors deſcribe their Tranſubſtantiation, whether the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine doth utterly periſh, and the ſubſtance of Chriſts Body and Bloud ſucceed in their place, which are both denied by Proteſtants.

7. The

7. The Church of *Rome* ſings on *Corpus Chriſti-day*, *This is not bread, but God and man my Saviour*. And the Council of *Trent* doth thus define it, *Becauſe Chriſt our Redeemer ſaid truly, that that was his Body, which he gave in the appearance of bread; therefore it was ever believed by the Church of God, and is now declared by this ſacred Synod, that by the power of Conſecration the whole ſubſtance of the bread is changed into the ſubſtance of Chriſt's Body, and the whole ſubſtance of the Wine into the ſubſtance of his Bloud, which change is fitly and properly called Tranſubſtantiation by the holy Catholick (Roman) Church. Therefore if any one ſhall ſay, That the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine remains with the Body and Bloud of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and ſhall deny that wonderful and ſingular converſion of the whole ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine into the ſubſtance of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, the only appearance and outward form of the Bread and Wine remaining, which converſion the Catholick (Roman) Church doth fitly call Tranſubſtantiation, let him be accurſed.* The Pope confirming this Council, defines it after the ſame manner, impoſeth an Oath and Declaration to the ſame purpoſe, and ſo makes it one of the new Articles of the *Roman* Faith, in the form, and under the penalty following: I. N. *do profeſs and firmly*

Conc. Trident. Seſſ. 13. c. 4.

Ibid. Can. 2.

Bulla Pii Papæ 4. Confir. Conc. Trident.

firmly believe all and every the ſingulars contained in the Confeſſion of Faith allowed by the holy Church of Rome; viz. *I believe in one God,* &c. *I alſo profeſs that the Body and Bloud with the Soul and Godhead of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt are truly, really, and ſubſtantially in the Maſs, and in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, and that there is a converſion of the whole ſubſtance of the Bread into the Body, and of the whole ſubſtance of the Wine into the Bloud of Chriſt, which converſion the Roman Catholick Church calls Tranſubſtantiation. I fully embrace all things defined, declared, and delivered by the holy Council of* Trent, *and withall I do reject, condemn, and accurſe all things by it accurs'd, condemned, or rejected. I do confidently believe that this Faith, which I now willingly profeſs, is the true Catholick Faith without the which it is impoſſible to be ſaved; and I do promiſe, vow, and ſwear, that I will conſtantly keep it whole and undefiled to my very laſt breath: So help me God and theſe Holy Goſpels.* Afterwards he bravely concludes this Decree with this Comminati-on: *Let no man therefore dare to attempt the breaking of this our Deed and Injunction, or be ſo deſperate as to oppoſe it. And if any one preſumes upon ſuch an attempt, let him know that he thereby incurs the wrath of Almighty God, and of his bleſſed Apoſtles* Peter *and* Paul.

Given

Given at Rome *in St.* Peters *Church the Thirteenth of* November *in the year of our Lord* 1564. *the fifth of our Pontificat.* Which is as much as to ſay, That he had received this his *Roman* Faith from Pope *Innocent the Third*, who firſt decided and impoſed this Doctrine of the Tranſubſtantiation of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, and made it an Article of Faith, adding this new-deviſed Thirteenth to the ancient Twelve Articles, for ſo we find it publiſhed in his Decretal propounded to the Aſſembly at *Lateran* in 1215. and proclaimed afterwards by his Nephew Pope *Gregory the Ninth.* Thus: *We firmly believe and ſimply acknowledge that there is one only true God*, &c. *and that in the Sacrament of the Altar the Body and Bloud of Chriſt are truly contained under the accidents of Bread and Wine, which are tranſubſtantiated, the Bread into the Body, and the Wine into the Bloud.* To theſe definitions of Popes I will add only the Tenets of three *Jeſuits*, which are highly approved by the late followers of the new *Roman* Faith. Firſt, Of *Alphonſus Salmeron*, *We muſt of neceſſity* (ſaith he) *hold Tranſubſtantiation, that the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, which* Luther *and ſome others admit, may be excluded; that the words of Chriſt*

Decret. de ſum. Trin. & fide Cathol. Tit. 1.

Tom. 9. *Tract.* 16.

Christ (which yet are most true without that) *may be verified*; *that how few of these many are pertinent to their purpose will be seen hereafter*; *many Testimonies of the Fathers, concerning Conversion, Mutation, Consecration, Benediction, Transformation, Sanctification* (*for by all these names almost, they have called Transubstantiation*) *may stand firm, and not be vain and insignificant*; *and lastly, that we may maintain a solid presence of the Body and Bloud of Christ.* Item, *as* David *changed his Countenance before* Abimelech, *and then received the Shew-bread, that was a certain Type of the Eucharist, so Christ in the Sacrament feigns himself to be bread, and yet is not bread, though he seems so to be most visibly.* Secondly, Of Cardinal *Francis Tolet*; *The words of Consecration are efficacious instruments whereby to Transubstantiate the substance of the Bread into the true Body of Christ*; *so that after they are spoken, there remains in the Host none of the substance of the Bread, but only the accidents of it, which are called the properties of the Bread, under which the true Body of Christ is present.* Thirdly, and lastly, Of Cardinal *Bellarmine*, *The Catholick Church ever taught, that by the conversion of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Bloud of Christ* (*which conversion hath been in after times called Transubstantiation*) *it comes to pass,*

Tom. 16. disp. 3. in Ep. S. Petri.

Instr. Sacerd. l. 2. c. 27.

Lib. 2. de Euchar. cap. 11.

that the Body and Bloud of our Lord are truly and really present in the Sacrament. It would be to no purpose to bring the Testimonies of others of the Latine or Roman Church who give to the Pope an absolute power of defining what he pleaseth, for they are but the same stuff as these: but if any one hath a mind let him consult *Gretserus* his defence of *Bellarmine*, or his Dialogue who first writ against *Luther*, who both reduce the whole matter to the judgment and decree of the Pope.

Gretſ def. Bellar. l.3.c 9. Syl. Prier. ſub initio.

8. Now we leave inquiring what God is able to do, for we should first know his will in this matter, before we examine his power: Yet thus much we say, that this *Roman* Transubstantiation is so strange and monstrous, that it exceeds the nature of all Miracles. And though God by his Almightiness be able to turn the substance of bread into some other substance, yet none will believe that he doth it, as long as it appears to our senses, that the substance of the Bread doth still remain whole and entire. Certain it is, that hitherto we read of no such thing done in the Old or New Testament, and therefore this Tenet, being as unknown to the Ancients as it is ungrounded in Scripture, appears as yet to be very incredible, and there

there is no reason we should believe such an unauthorised figment, newly invented by men, and now imposed as an Article of Christian Religion. For it is in vain that they bring Scripture to defend this their stupendious Doctrine; and it is not true, what they so often and so confidently affirm, that the Universal Church hath always constantly owned it, being it was not so much as heard of in the Church for many Ages, and hath been but lately approved by the Popes Authority in the Councils of *Lateran* and *Trent*, as I shall prove in the following Chapters.

CHAP. V.

That neither the word nor name of Tranſubſtantiation, nor the Doctrine or the thing it ſelf is taught or contained in holy Scripture, or in the Writings of the ancient Doctors of the Church, but rather is contrary to them; and therefore not of Faith.

1. THE word Tranſubſtantiation is ſo far from being found either in the ſacred Records, or in the Monuments of the ancient Fathers, that the maintainers of it do themſelves acknowledge that it was not ſo much as heard of before the twelfth Century. For though one *Stephanus*, Biſhop of *Autun*, be ſaid to have once uſed it, yet it is without proof that ſome Modern Writers make him one of the tenth Century; nor yet doth he ſay, that the bread is Tranſubſtantiated, *but as it were* Tranſubſtantiated, which * well underſtood might be admitted.

*See *ch.* 1. *art.* 6. *c.* 3 *art.* 4. *c.* 4. *art.* 5, and this *ch. art.* 5.

2. Nay, that the thing it ſelf without the word, that the Doctrine without the expreſſion

expreſſion cannot be found in Scripture, is ingeniouſly acknowledged by the moſt learned Schoolmen *Scotus*, *Durandus*, *Biel*, *Cameracenſis*, *Cajetan*, and many more, who finding it not, brought in by the Popes Authority, and received in the *Roman* Church, till 1200 years after Chriſt, yet endeavoured to defend it by other Arguments.

3. *Scotus* confeſt, *That there is not any place in Scripture ſo expreſs as to compel a man to admit of Tranſubſtantiation, were it not that the Church hath declared for it,* (that is, Pope *Innocent* III, in his *Lateran* Council.) *Durandus* ſaid, *That the word is found, but that by it, the manner they contend for cannot be proved.* *Biel* affirms, *That it is no where found in Canonical Scriptures.* *Occam* declared, *That it is eaſier, more reaſonable, leſs inconvenient, and better agreeing with Scripture, to hold that the ſubſtance of the Bread remains.* After him Cardinal *Cameracenſis* doth alſo confeſs, *That Tranſubſtantiation cannot be proved out of the Scriptures.* Nay, the Biſhop of *Rocheſter* ſaith himſelf, *That there is no expreſſion in Scripture whereby that converſion of ſubſtance in the Maſs can be made good.* Cardinal *Cajetan* likewiſe, *There is not any thing of force enough in the Goſpel to make us underſtand in a proper ſenſe theſe words,* This

Scot. in 4. Sent. d. 11. q. 3.

Durand. ut ſupra.

Biel in Can. miſſa lect. 40.

Occam. Cent l. 4. q. 6. & in 4. Sent. d. 11. q. 6.

Cam. in 4. d. 11. q. 6.

L contra Luth de Capt Babil. c. 1.

Cajetan in Tho. p 3. q. 75. art. 1

is my body: *Nay, that presence which the Church* (of Rome) *believes in the Sacrament cannot be proved by the words of Christ without the declaration of the* (Roman) *Church.* Ibid. q. 45. art. 4. Lastly, *Bellarmine* himself doth say, *That though he might bring Scripture clear enough, to his thinking, to prove Transubstantiation by, to an easie man, yet still it would be doubtful whether he had done it to purpose, because some very acute and learned men, as* Scotus, *hold that it cannot be proved by Scripture.* Bell. de Euch. l. 3. c. 23. Now in this, Protestants desire no more but to be of the opinion of those learned and acute men.

4. And indeed, the words of institution would plainly make it appear to any man that would prefer truth to wrangling, that it is with the Bread, that the Lords Body is given, (as his Bloud with the Wine) for Christ, having taken, blessed, and broken the bread, said, *This is my body*; and St. *Paul*, than whom none could better understand the meaning of Christ, explains it thus, *The bread which we break is the* κοινωνία, *Communion or communication of the body of Christ*, that whereby his body is given, and the Faithful are made partakers of it. That it was bread which he reacht to them, there was no need of any proof, the receiver's senses sufficiently convinc'd them of it; but that therewith

with his body was given, none could have known, had it not been declared by him who is the truth it ſelf. And though, by the divine inſtitution and the explication of the Apoſtle every faithful Communicant may be as certainly aſſured that he receives the Lords Body, as if he knew that the Bread is ſubſtantially turned into it, yet it doth not therefore follow, that the Bread is ſo changed, that its ſubſtance is quite done away, ſo that there remains nothing preſent, but the very natural Body of Chriſt, made of bread: For certain it is, that the bread is not the Body of Chriſt any otherwiſe than as the Cup is the New Teſtament, and two different conſequences cannot be drawn from thoſe two not different expreſſions. Therefore as the Cup cannot be the New Teſtament but by a Sacramental figure, no more can the Bread be the Body of Chriſt, but in the ſame ſenſe.

5. As to what *Bellarmine* and others ſay, That it is not poſſible the words of Chriſt can be true, but by that converſion, which the Church of *Rome* calls Tranſubſtantiation, that is ſo far from being ſo, that if it were admitted, it would firſt deny the Divine Omnipotency, as though God were not able to make the Body of Chriſt

preſent, and truly to give it in the Sacrament, whilſt the ſubſtance of the Bread remains. 2. It would be inconſiſtent with the Divine Benediction which preſerves things in their proper being. 3. It would be contrary to the true nature of a Sacrament, which always conſiſteth of two parts. And laſtly, It would in ſome manner deſtroy the true ſubſtance of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, which cannot be ſaid to be made of Bread and Wine by a Prieſt, without a moſt high preſumption. But the truth of the words of Chriſt remains conſtant, and can be defended, without overthrowing ſo many other great truths. Suppoſe a Teſtator puts Deeds and Titles in the hand of his Heir, with theſe words, Take the Houſe which I bequeath thee; There is no man will think that thoſe Writings and Parchments are that very Houſe which is made of Wood or Stones, and yet no man will ſay that the Teſtator ſpake falſly or obſcurely. Likewiſe our bleſſed Saviour, having ſanctified the Elements by his words and prayers, gave them to his Diſciples as Seals of the New Teſtament, whereby they were as certainly ſecured of thoſe rich and precious Legacies which he left to them, as Children are of their

Fathers

Fathers Lands and Inheritance, by Deeds and Inſtruments ſigned and delivered for that purpoſe.

6. To the Sacred Records we may add the judgment of the Primitive Church. For thoſe Orthodox and holy Doctors of our holier Religion, thoſe great Lights of the Catholick Church, do all clearly, conſtantly, and unanimouſly conſpire in this, That the preſence of the Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament is only myſtick and ſpiritual. As for the entire annihilation of the ſubſtance of the Bread and the Wine, or that new and ſtrange Tenet of Tranſubſtantiation, they did not ſo much as hear or ſpeak any thing of it: Nay, the conſtant ſtream of their Doctrine doth clearly run againſt it, how great ſoever are the brags and pretences of the Papiſts to the contrary. And if you will hear them one by one, I ſhall bring ſome of their moſt noted paſſages only, that our labour may not be endleſs by rehearſing all that they have ſaid to our purpoſe on this ſubject.

7. I ſhall begin with that holy and ancient Doctor, *Juſtin Martyr*, who is one of the firſt after the Apoſtles times, whoſe undoubted Writings are come to us. What was believed at *Rome* and elſewhere in his time, concerning this holy myſtery, may

Juſt. Mart. An. Dom. 144.

may well be underſtood out of theſe his words: *After that the Biſhop hath prayed, and bleſſed, and the people ſaid Amen, thoſe whom we call Deacons or Miniſters give to every one of them that are preſent a portion of the Bread and Wine; and that food we call the Euchariſt, for we do not receive it as ordinary Bread and Wine.* They received it as bread, yet not as common bread. And a little after, *By this food digeſted, our fleſh and blood are fed, and we are taught that it is the Body and Bloud of Jeſus Chriſt.* Therefore the ſubſtance of the Bread remains, and remains corruptible food, even after the Conſecration, which can in no wiſe be ſaid of the immortal Body of Chriſt: For the fleſh of Chriſt is not turned into our fleſh, neither doth it nouriſh it, as doth that food which is Sacramentally called the Fleſh of Chriſt. But the Fleſh of Chriſt feeds our ſouls unto eternal life.

Apol. 2. ad Anton. prope finem.

8. After the ſame manner, it is written by that holy Martyr *Irenæus* Biſhop much about the ſame time. *The bread which is from the earth is no more common bread, after the invocation of God upon it, but is become the Euchariſt conſiſting of two parts, the one earthly, and the other heavenly.* There would be nothing earthly if the ſubſtance of the bread were removed. Again,

St. Iren. A.D. 160.

Lib. 4. Cont. Hæreſ. c. 34.

As

As the grain of Wheat falling in the ground, and dying, riſeth again much increaſed, and then receiving the word of God becomes the Euchariſt (which is the Body and Bloud of Chriſt;) *So likewiſe our bodies nouriſhed by it, laid in the ground and diſſolved, ſhall riſe again in their time.* Again, *we are fed by the Creature, but it is he himſelf that gives it, he hath ordained and appointed that Cup which is a Creature, and his Bloud alſo, and that Bread which is a Creature, and alſo his Body. And ſo when the Bread and the Cup are bleſſed by Gods Word, they become the Euchariſt of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, and from them our bodies receive nouriſhment and increaſe.* Now that our fleſh is fed and encreaſed by the natural body of Chriſt cannot be ſaid without great impiety by themſelves that hold Tranſubſtantiation. For naturally nothing nouriſheth our bodies but what is made fleſh and bloud by the laſt digeſtion, which it would be blaſphemous to ſay of the incorruptible body of Chriſt. Yet the ſacred Elements which in ſome manner are, and are ſaid to be the body and bloud of Chriſt, yield nouriſhment and encreaſe to our bodies by their earthly nature, in ſuch ſort, that by vertue alſo of the heavenly and ſpiritual food which the faithful receive by means of the material,

Lib 5. c. 12.

Ibid.

our

our bodies are fitted for a bleſſed Reſurrection to immortal glory.

Tertul. A.D.200. 9. *Tertullian*, who flouriſhed about the two hundredth year after Chriſt, when as yet he was Catholick, and acted by a pious zeal, wrote againſt *Marcion* the Heretick, who amongſt his other impious opinions taught that Chriſt had not taken of the Virgin *Mary* the very nature and ſubſtance of a humane body, but only the outward forms and appearances; out of which Fountain the *Romiſh* Tranſubſtantiators ſeem to have drawn their Doctrine of accidents abſtracted from their ſubject hanging in the air, that is, ſubſiſting on nothing. *Contra Marcion. l.4.c.40.* *Tertullian*, diſputing againſt this wicked Hereſie, draws an Argument from the Sacrament of the Euchariſt to prove that Chriſt had not a Phantaſtick and imaginary, but a true and natural body, thus. The figure of the Body of Chriſt proves it to be natural, for there can be no figure of a Ghoſt or a Phantaſm. *But* (ſaith he) *Chriſt having taken the Bread, and given it to his Diſciples made it his Body by ſaying, This is my Body, that is, the figure of my Body. Now, it could not have been a figure except the body were real, for a meer appearance, an imaginary Phantaſm is not capable of a figure.* Each part of this Argument

Argument is true, and contains a neceſſary Concluſion. For 1. The bread muſt remain bread, otherwiſe *Marcion* would have returned the Argument againſt *Tertullian*, ſaying as the Tranſubſtantiators; It was not bread, but meerly the accidents of bread, which ſeemed to be bread. 2. The Body of Chriſt is proved to be true by the figure of it, which is ſaid to be bread: For the bread is fit to repreſent that divine Body, becauſe of its nouriſhing vertue, which in the bread is earthly, but in the body is heavenly. Laſtly, The realty of the Body is proved by that of its figure, and ſo if you deny the ſubſtance of the bread (as the Papiſts do) you thereby deſtroy the truth and realty of the Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament.

10. *Origen* alſo, about the ſame time with *Tertullian*, ſpeaks much after the ſame manner, *If Chriſt* (ſaith he) *as theſe men* (the Marcionites) *falſly hold, had neither Fleſh nor Bloud, of what manner of Fleſh, of what Body, of what Bloud did he give the Signs and Images when he gave the Bread and Wine?* If they be the ſigns and repreſentations of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, though they prove the truth of his Body and Bloud, yet they being ſigns, cannot be

Origen. A D. 210. Dial. 3. de Hom. Chriſto contra Marcion.

be what they ſignifie, and they not being what they repreſent, the groundleſs contrivance of Tranſubſtantiation is overthrown. Alſo upon *Leviticus* he doth expreſly oppoſe it thus: *Acknowledge ye that they are figures, and therefore ſpiritual, not carnal, examine and underſtand what is ſaid, otherwiſe if you receive as things carnal, they will hurt, but not nouriſh you. For in the Goſpel there is the Letter, which kills him that underſtands not ſpiritually what is ſaid; for if you underſtand this ſaying according to the Letter, Except you eat my Fleſh and drink my Bloud, the Letter will kill you.* Therefore as much as theſe words belong to the eating and drinking of Chriſts Body and Bloud, they are to be underſtood myſtically and ſpiritually. Again, writing on St. *Matthew*, he doth manifeſtly put a difference betwixt the true and immortal, and the Typick and Myſtical Body of Chriſt: For the Sacrament conſiſteth of both. *That food* (ſaith he) *which is ſanctified by the Word of God and Prayer, as far as it is material, deſcends into the belly and is caſt out into the draught*; this he ſaith of the Typick, which is the figure of the true Body. God forbid we ſhould have any ſuch thoughts of the true and heavenly Body of Chriſt; as they muſt that underſtand his

Homil. 7. in Lev.

Mat. 15.

Origen *is unjuſtly numbred by reaſon of theſe words among the Hereticks called* Stercoraniſtæ.

his natural body by what *Origen* calls his material and Sacramental body, which no man in his wits can underſtand of meer accidents.

11. St. *Cyprian*, Biſhop of *Carthage*, a glorious Martyr of Chriſt, wrote a famous Epiſtle to *Coecilius* concerning the ſacred Chalice in the Lords Supper, whereof this is the ſum: *Let that Cup which is offered to the people in commemoration of Chriſt be mixt with Wine* (againſt the opinion of the *Aquarii* who were for water only) *for it cannot repreſent the Blood of Chriſt when there is no Wine in the Cup, becauſe the Blood of Chriſt is expreſt by the Wine, as the Faithful are underſtood by the water.* But the Patrons of Tranſubſtantiation have neither Wine nor Water in the Chalice they offer; and yet without them (eſpecially the Wine appointed by our bleſſed Saviour, and whereof *Cyprian* chiefly ſpeaks) the Bloud of Chriſt is not ſo much as Sacramentally preſent; *So far was* the Primitive Church from any thing of believing a corporal preſence of the Bloud, the Wine being reduced to nothing (that is to a meer accident without a ſubſtance) for then they muſt have ſaid, that the Water was changed into the People, as well as the Wine into the Bloud.

S. Cyprian A.D. 250.

L. 2 Ep. 3. ſive 63. Edit. Pamel.

Bloud. But there is no need that I ſhould bring many teſtimonies of that Father, when all his Writings do plainly declare that the true ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine is given in the Euchariſt, that, that ſpiritual and quickning food which the Faithful get from the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, and the mutual Union of the whole People joyned into one body may anſwer their Type, the Sacrament which repreſents them.

Con. Nice. A.D. 325.

12. Thoſe words of the Council of *Nice* are well known, whereby the Faithful are called from the conſideration of the outward viſible Elements of Bread and Wine, to attend the inward and ſpiritual act of the mind, whereby Chriſt is ſeen and apprehended. *Let not our thoughts dwell low, on that Bread and that Cup which are ſet before us, but lifting up our minds by faith let us conſider, that on this ſacred Table is laid the Lamb of God which taketh away the ſins of the world. — And receiving truly his precious Body and Bloud, let us believe theſe things to be the Pledges and Emblems of our Reſurrection: for we do not take much, but only a little* (of the Elements) *that we may be mindful, we do it not for Satiety, but for Sanctification.* Now, who is there, even among the Maintainers of Tranſubſtantiation, that will

In actis ibid. a Gel. Cyzic. conſcript.

will underſtand this, *not much, but a little,* of the Body of Chriſt? Or who can believe that the *Nicene* Fathers would call his Body and Bloud Symbols in a proper ſenſe? When nothing can be an Image or a ſign of it ſelf. And therefore, though we are not to reſt in the Elements, minding nothing elſe (for we ſhould conſider what is chiefeſt in the Sacrament, that we have our hearts *lifted up unto the Lord,* who is given together with the ſigns) yet Elements they are, and the earthly part of the Sacrament, both the Bread and the Wine, which deſtroys Tranſubſtantiation.

13. St. *Athanaſius,* famous in the time, and preſent in the Aſſembly of the *Nicene* Council, a ſtout Champion of the Catholick Faith, acknowledgeth none other but a ſpiritual Manducation of the Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament. *Our Lord* (ſaith he) *made a difference betwixt the Fleſh and the Spirit, that we might underſtand that what he ſaid, was not carnal, but ſpiritual. For how many men could his body have fed, that the whole world ſhould be nouriſhed by it? But therefore he mentioned his aſcenſion into heaven, that they might not take what he ſaid in a corporal ſenſe, but might underſtand that* St. Athan. A. D. 330.

In illud Evangelii; Quicunq; dixerit verbum, &c. & in c. 6. St. Joh. qui manducat carnem meam, &c.

πνευματικὴν τροφὴν. *his Fleſh whereof he ſpake is a ſpiritual and heavenly food given by himſelf from on high; for the words that I ſpake unto you they are ſpirit, and they are life, as if he ſhould ſay, My Body which is ſhewn and given for the world, ſhall be given in food, that it may be diſtributed* πνευματικῶς. *ſpiritually to every one, and preſerve them all to the Reſurrection to eternal life.* Cardinal *Perron* having nothing to anſwer to theſe words of this holy Father, in a kind of deſpair, rejects the whole Tractate, and denies it to be *Athanaſius*'s, which no body ever did before him, there being no reaſon for it.

De Euch. l. 2. c. 1. ar. 10.

St. Cyril of Hier. A. D. 350.

14. *Cyril*, Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, of the ſame Age with St. *Athanaſius*, treating of the Chriſme, wherewith they then anointed thoſe that were Baptized, ſpeaks thus: *Take heed thou doſt not think that this is a meer Oyntment only. For as the Bread of the Euchariſt after the Invocation of the Holy Ghoſt is no longer ordinary Bread, but is the Body of Chriſt; ſo this holy Oyntment is no longer a bare common Oyntment after it is conſecrated, but is the gift or grace of Chriſt, which, by his Divine Nature, and the coming of the Holy Ghoſt, is made efficacious; ſo that the Body is anointed with the Oyntment, but the ſoul is ſanctified by the holy and vivifying Spirit.* Can any thing more clear be ſaid?

Chatech. myſt. 3.

Either

Either the Oyntment is tranſubſtantiated by conſecration into the ſpirit and grace of Chriſt, or the Bread and Wine are not tranſubſtantiated by Conſecration into the Body and Bloud of Chriſt. Therefore as the Oyntment retains ſtill its ſubſtance, and yet is not called a meer or common ointment, but the *Chariſme* or grace of Chriſt: So the Bread and Wine remaining ſo, as to their ſubſtance, yet are not ſaid to be only Bread and Wine common and ordinary, but alſo the Body and Bloud of Chriſt. *Under the Type of Bread* (ſaith he) *the Body is given thee, and the Bloud under the type of the Wine.* This *Grodecius* doth captiouſly and unfaithfully interpret, under the appearances of Bread and Wine; for thoſe meer appearances or accidents ſubſiſting without a ſubject never ſo much as entred into the mind of any of the Ancients.

Catech. Myſt. 4. Thy bodily Palate (ſaith he) taſteth one thing there, and thy faith another.

15. Much to the ſame purpoſe we have in the *Anaphora* or Liturgy attributed to St. *Baſil*; *We have ſet before you the Type of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt*, which he calls the Bread of the Euchariſt after the Conſecration. If it be the Type of the Body, then certainly it cannot be the Body and nothing elſe: For (as we ſaid before) nothing can be the figure of it ſelf, no

St. Baſil. A.D. 360.

Lib. de Spir. Sanct.

more than a man can be his own Son or Father. There be also Prayers in that Liturgy, *That the Bread may become the Body of Christ for the remission of sins, and life eternal to the receivers.* Now true it is, that to the faithful the Element becomes a vivifying Body, because they are truly partakers of the heavenly bread, the Body of Christ: but to others, who either receive not, or are not believers, to them the Bread may be the Antitype, but is not, neither doth become the Body of Christ, for without Faith Christ is never eaten, as is gathered from the same Father.

Lib de Bapt.

St. Greg. Nyss. A.D. 370.

16 St. *Gregory Nyssene*, his Brother, doth clearly declare what change is wrought in the Bread and Wine by Consecration, saying, *As the Altar naturally is but common stone, but being consecrated becomes an holy Table, a spotless Altar; so the bread of the Eucharist is at first ordinary, but being mysteriously sacrificed, it is, and is called the Body of Christ, and is efficacious to great purposes; and as the Priest (yesterday a Lay-man) by the Blessing of Ordination, becomes a Doctor of Piety, and a Steward of Mysteries, and though not changed in body or shape, yet is transformed and made better as to his soul, by an invisible power and grace; so also by the same consequence, water, being nothing but water of it self, yet*

Orat. de S. Baptis.

blest

bleſt by a heavenly grace, renews the man, working a ſpiritual regeneration in him. Now let the Aſſertors of Tranſubſtantiation maintain that a Stone is ſubſtantially changed into an Altar, a man into a Prieſt, the water in Baptiſm into an inviſible grace, or elſe that the Bread is not ſo changed into the Body of Chriſt: For according to this Father there is the ſame conſequence in them all.

17 Likewiſe St. *Ambroſe* explaining what manner of alteration is in the bread, when in the Euchariſt it becomes the Body of Chriſt, ſaith: *Thou hadſt indeed a being, but wert an old creature, but being now Baptized or conſecrated, thou art become a new creature.* The ſame change that happens to man in Baptiſm, happens to the Bread in the Sacrament: If the nature of man is not ſubſtantially altered by the new Birth, no more is the bread by Conſecration. Man becomes by Baptiſm, not what Nature made him, but what Grace new-makes him; and *the Bread becomes by Conſecration, not what it was by Nature, but what the Bleſſing conſecrates it to be.* For Nature made only a meer man, and made only common bread; but Regeneration, of a meer man, makes a holy man, in whom Chriſt dwells ſpiritually: And likewiſe

St Ambr. A D.380.

L de Sacram.4. cap.4.

Ibid.de init.myſt. cap.9.

the Conſecration of common bread makes Myſtick and Sacramental bread. Yet this change doth not deſtroy Nature, but to Nature adds Grace: As is yet more plainly expreſt by that holy Father in the fore-cited place. *Perhaps thou wilt ſay* (ſaith he) *this my bread is common bread; it is bread indeed before the bleſſing of the Sacrament, but when it is conſecrated it becomes the Body of Chriſt. This we are therefore to declare, how can that which is bread be alſo the body of Chriſt? By Conſecration. And Conſecration is made by the words of our Lord, that the venerable Sacrament may be perfected. You ſee how efficacious is the word of Chriſt. If there be then ſo great a power in the word of Chriſt to make the Bread and Wine to be what they were not, how much greater is that power, which ſtill preſerves them to be what they were, and yet makes them to be what they were not? Therefore, that I may anſwer thee, it was not the Body of Chriſt before the Conſecration, but now after the Conſecration, it is the Body of Chriſt; he ſaid the word and it was done; thou thy ſelf wert before, but wert an old Creature; after thou haſt been conſecrated in Baptiſm thou art become a new creature.* By theſe words St. *Ambroſe* teacheth how we are to underſtand that the Bread is the Body of Chriſt, to wit, by ſuch a change that the Bread and

De Sacr. l. 4. c. 4.

Wine

Wine do not ceaſe to be what they were as to their ſubſtance (for then they ſhould not be what they were) and yet by the Bleſſing become what before they were not. For ſo they are ſaid to remain (as indeed they do) what they were by nature, that yet they are changed by grace, that is, they become aſſured Sacraments of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, and by that means certain pledges of our Juſtification and Redemption. What is there, can refute more expreſly the dream of Tranſubſtantiation?

18. St. *Chryſoſtome* doth alſo clearly diſcard and reject this carnal Tranſubſtantiation and eating of Chriſts Body, without eating the bread. *Sacraments* (ſaith he) *ought not to be contemplated and conſidered carnally, but with the eyes of our ſouls, that is, ſpiritually; for ſuch is the nature of myſteries*: where obſerve the oppoſition betwixt *carnally* and *ſpiritually* which admits of no plea or reply again. *As in Baptiſm the ſpiritual power of Regeneration is given to the material water; ſo alſo the immaterial gift of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt is not received by any ſenſible corporal action, but by the ſpiritual diſcernment of our faith, and of our hearts and minds.* Which is no more than this, that ſenſible things are called by the name of

St. Chryſ. A.D. 390.

Hom. 24. in St. Joh.

Ibid.

thoſe ſpiritual things which they ſeal and ſignifie. But he ſpeaks more plainly in his Epiſtle to *Cæſarius*; where he teacheth that in this Myſtery, there is not in the bread a ſubſtantial, but a Sacramental change, according to the which, the outward Elements take the name of what they repreſent, and are changed in ſuch a ſort, that they ſtill retain their former natural ſubſtance. *The bread* (ſaith he) *is made worthy to be honoured with the name of the Fleſh of Chriſt, by the conſecration of the Prieſt, yet the Fleſh retains the proprieties of its incorruptible nature, as the bread doth its natural ſubſtance. Before the bread be ſanctified we call it bread; but when it is conſecrated by the divine grace, it deſerves to be called the Lords Body, though the ſubſtance of the bread ſtill remains.* When *Bellarmine* could not anſwer this teſtimony of that Great Doctor, he thought it enough to deny, that this Epiſtle is St. *Chryſoſtoms* (a) but both he and (b) *Poſſevin* do vainly contend that it is not extant among the works of *Chryſoſtom*. For beſides that at *Florence* (c) and elſe where it was to be found among them, it is cited in the Collections againſt the *Severians* which are in the verſion of *Turrianus* the *Jeſuit*, in the fourth Tome of *Antiq. lectionum* of *Henry Caniſius*,

In Ep. ad Cæſar. contra hereſ. Apol.

a *L. de Euch. 2. c 22.*
b *In appar. Chryſ.*
c *Steph. Gard. Ep. Wint. cont Pet Mart. lib. 2. de Euchar.*

Caniſius, and in the end of the book of *Joh. Damaſcenus* againſt the *Acephali*. I bring another Teſtimony out of *the imperfect work* on St. *Matthew*, written either by St. *Chryſoſtome*, or ſome other ancient Author; a Book in this at leaſt very Orthodox, and not corrupted by the *Arrians*. *In theſe ſanctified veſſels*, (ſaith he) *the true body of Chriſt is not contained, but the Myſtery of his Body.*

19. Which alſo hath been ſaid by St. *Auſtin* above a thouſand times; but out of ſo many almoſt numberleſs places I ſhall chuſe only three, which are as the ſum of all the reſt. *You are not to eat this Body which you ſee, nor drink this Bloud which my Crucifiers ſhall ſhed, I have left you a Sacrament which, ſpiritually underſtood, will viviſie you.* Thus St. *Auſtin* rehearſing the words of Chriſt again; *If Sacraments had not ſome reſemblance with thoſe things whereof they are Sacraments, they could not be Sacraments at all. From this reſemblance they often take the names of what they repreſent. Therefore as the Sacrament of Chriſts body is in ſome ſort his body; ſo the Sacrament of Faith, is faith alſo.* To the ſame ſenſe is what he writes againſt *Maximinus* the *Arrian*. *We mind in the Sacraments, not what they are, but what they ſhew; for they are ſigns, which are one thing, and ſignifie another.*

S. Auſtin. A.D. 400.

In Pſal. 98.

Epiſt. 23. *ad Bonif.*

Cont. Max. l. 3. *c.* 22.

another. And in another place ſpeaking of the Bread and Wine. *Let no man look to what they are, but to what they ſignifie, for our Lord was pleaſed to ſay, this is my Body, when he gave the ſign of his body.* This paſſage of St. *Auſtin* is ſo clear, that it admits of no evaſion nor no denial. For if the Sacraments are one thing, and ſignifie another, then they are not ſo changed into what they ſignifie, as that after that change they ſhould be no more what they were. The water is changed in baptiſm as the Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper, but all that is changed is not preſently aboliſhed or Tranſubſtantiated. For as the water remains entire in Baptiſm, ſo do the Bread and Wine in the Euchariſt.

De Doctr. Chriſt. cap. 7.

St. Proſp. A.D. 430.

20. St. *Proſper*, Orthodox in all things, who lived almoſt in the time of *Auſtin*, teacheth, *That the Euchariſt conſiſteth of two things, the viſible appearance of the Elements, and the inviſible Fleſh and Bloud of our Saviour Chriſt, (that is, the Sacrament, and the grace of the Sacrament) as the perſon of Chriſt is both God and Man.* Who but the infamous Heretick *Eutyches* would ſay that Chriſt, as God, was ſubſtantially changed into man, or as man, into God?

Sent. Proſ. diſt. 2. de corſ: cap. hoc eſt.

B. Theodoret 7.

21. Upon this ſubject, nothing can be more clear than this of *Theodor.* whence we learn

learn what the Primitive Church believes in this matter. *Our Saviour, in the Inſtitution of the Euchariſt, changed the names of things, giving to his body the name of its Sacrament, and to the Sacrament the name of his Body.* Now this was done for this reaſon, as he ſaith, *that they that are partakers of the Divine Myſteries, might not mind the nature of what they ſee, but by the change of names, might believe that change which is wrought by Grace. For he that called what by nature is his body, Wheat and Bread; he alſo honoured the Elements and Signs with the names of his Body and Bloud, not changing what is natural, but adding Grace to it.* He therefore teacheth that ſuch an alteration is wrought in the Elements, that ſtill their nature and ſubſtance continues, as he explains more plainly afterwards. For when the Heretick that ſtands for *Eutichius*, had ſaid, *as the Sacrament of the Lords Body and Bloud are one thing before the Prayer of the Prieſt, and afterwards being changed, become another; ſo alſo the Body of our Lord after his aſcention is changed into the divine ſubſtance and nature* (according to the Tenet of the Tranſubſtantiator this *Eutychian* Argument is irrefragable, but) Catholick Antiquity anſwers it thus: *Thou are entangled in the nets of thine own knitting; for the Elements or Myſtick ſigns*

Dial. 1.

Ibid.

Dial. 2.

ſigns depart not from their nature after Conſecration, but remain in their former ſubſtance, form, and kind, and can be ſeen and toucht as much as before: and yet withal we underſtand alſo what they become now they are changed. Compare therefore the Copy with the Original, and thou ſhalt ſee their likeneſs. For a figure muſt anſwer to the truth. That body hath the ſame form, and fills the ſame ſpace as before, and in a word is the ſame ſubſtance; but after its reſurrection, it is become immortal, &c. All this and much more is taught by *Theodoret*, who aſſiſted at the univerſal Councils of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*. It is an idle exception which is made by ſome in the Church of *Rome*, as though by the nature and ſubſtance of the Elements, which are ſaid to remain, *Theodoret* had underſtood the nature and ſubſtance of the accidents, (as Cardinal *Bellarmine* is pleaſed to ſpeak moſt abſurdly:) but the whole context doth ſtrongly refute this gloſs, for *Theodoret* joyns together nature, ſubſtance, form, and figure; and indeed, what Anſwer could they have given to the *Eutychian* Argument, if the ſubſtance of the bread being annihilated after the Conſecration, the accidents only remain? Or did Chriſt ſay concerning the accidents of the Bread and Wine, theſe accidents

L. 2. de Euch. c. 27

are,

are, or this accident is my body? But (though we have not that liberty, yet) the Inventors of Tranſubſtantiation may when they pleaſe make a Creator of a Creature, ſubſtances of accidents, accidents of ſubſtances, and any thing out of any thing. But ſure they are too immodeſt and uncharitable, who, to elude the authority of ſo famous and ſo worthy a Father as *Theodoret*, alledge that he was accuſed of ſome errours in the Council of *Epheſus*, though he repented afterwards, as they themſelves a re forced to confeſs. Fain would they if they could get out at this door, when they cannot deny that he affirmed, that the Elements remain in their natural ſubſtance, as he wrote in the Dialogues which he compoſed againſt the *Eutychian* Hereticks, with the applauſe and approbation of the Catholick Church. And indeed the evidence of this truth hath compelled ſome of our Adverſaries to yield that *Theodoret* is of our ſide. For in the Epiſtle before the Dialogues of *Theodoret* in the *Roman* Edition, ſet forth by *Stephan Nicolinus*, the Popes Printer, in the year 1547, it is plainly ſet down. *That in what concern'd Tranſubſtantiation his opinion was not very ſound, but that he was to be excuſed, becauſe the Church* (*of* Rome) *had made no decree about it.* *Præf. in Dial. Theod.*

22. With

St. Gelaſ. A. 470, or 490. *plus minus.*

22. With *Theodoret* we may joyn *Gelaſius*, who (whether he were Biſhop of *Rome* or no, as *Bellarmine* confeſſeth, was of the ſame age and opinion as he, and therefore a witneſs ancient and credible enough. He wrote againſt *Eutyches* and *Neſtorius*, concerning the two natures in Chriſt, in this manner. *Doubtleſs, the Sacrament of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt which we receive, is a very divine thing, whereby we are made partakers of the divine nature; and yet it doth not ceaſe to be Bread and Wine, by ſubſtance and nature: And indeed, the image and reſemblance of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt is celebrated in this myſterious action. By this therefore we ſee manifeſtly enough, that we muſt believe that to be in Chriſt, which we believe to be in his Sacrament, that, as by the perfecting vertue of the Holy Ghoſt, it becomes a divine ſubſtance, and yet remains in the propriety of its nature; ſo this great Myſtery the Incarnation, of whoſe power and efficacy this is a lively image doth demonſtrate that there is one intire and true Chriſt, conſiſting of two natures, which yet properly remain unchanged. It doth plainly appear* out of theſe words, that the change wrought in the Sacrament is not ſubſtantial, for firſt, the ſanctified Elements are ſo made the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, that ſtill they continue to be, by nature

De duabus in Chriſto natur. in Biblioth. patrum. Tom. 4.

nature, Bread and Wine. Secondly, The Bread and Wine retain their natural properties, as alſo the two natures in Chriſt. Laſtly, The Elements are ſaid to become a divine ſubſtance, becauſe while we receive them, we are made partakers of the Divine Nature, by the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, which are given to us. Theſe things being ſo, their blindneſs is to be deplored who ſee not that they bring again into the Church of *Rome* the ſame Error which Antiquity piouſly and learnedly condemned in the *Eutychians*. And as for their thread-bare objection to this, *That by the ſubſtance of Bread and wine, the true ſubſtance it ſelf is not to be underſtood, but only the nature and eſſence of the accidents*, it is a very ſtrange and very poor ſhift. There is a great deal more of commendation due to the ingenuity of Cardinal *Contarenus*, who yielding to the evidence of truth, anſwered nothing to this plain Teſtimony of *Gelaſius*.

Bell. loco Citat. Baron. A. D. 496. nota Marg. ad verba Gelaſii in B. B. Patrum.

In Colloq. Ratisb. A. 1541.

23. Now I add *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, who ſaid, *That the Body and Bloud of Chriſt in the Sacrament are received only by a pure faith*, as we read in that Epiſtle againſt *Neſtorius*, which ſix hundred Fathers approved and confirmed in the Council of *Chalcedon*. I omit

St Cyril of Alex. The Coun. cil of Calc. Circa. An. 450. Inter Ep. Cyr. in Con. Eph. Con. Chal. Art. 5.

omit to mention the other Fathers of this Age, though many things in their Writings be as contrary to Tranſubſtantiation and the independency of accidents as any I have hitherto cited.

Ephrem. Ant. 540. 24. I come now to the Sixth Century, about the middle whereof *Ephrem*, Patriarch of *Antioch*, wrote a Book, which was read and commended by *Photius*, concerning ſacred Conſtitutions and Ceremonies againſt the *Eutychians*; therein, that he might prove the Hypoſtatical Union, that in Chriſt there is no confuſion of natures, but that each retains its own ſubſtance and properties, he brings the compariſon of the Sacramental Union, and denies that there ſhould be any converſion of one ſubſtance into another in the Sacrament. *No man* (ſaith he) *that hath any reaſon will ſay that the nature of the palpable, and impalpable, and the nature of the viſible and inviſible is the ſame. For ſo the Body of Chriſt which is received by the faithful, remains in its own ſubſtance, and yet withal is united to a ſpiritual grace; and ſo Baptiſm, though it becomes wholly ſpiritual, yet it loſeth not the ſenſible property of its ſubſtance (that's water) neither doth it ceaſe to be what it was made by grace.*

Phot. in Bibl. n. 229.

Ibid.

25. It

25. It is not very long ſince the works of *Facundus*, an *African* Biſhop, were Printed at *Paris*, but he lived in the ſame Century. Now what his Doctrine was againſt Tranſubſtantiation, as alſo of the Church in his time, is plainly to be ſeen by thoſe words of his, which I here tranſcribe. *Facund. Epiſc. A.D.550.*

The Sacrament of Adoption may be called Adoption, as the Sacrament of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, conſecrated in the Bread and Wine is ſaid to be his Body and Bloud; not that his Body be Bread, or his Bloud Wine, but becauſe the Bread and Wine are the Sacrament of his Body and Bloud, and therefore ſo called by Chriſt, when he gave them to his Diſciples. *Lib 9.c.5.*

Sirmondus the *Jeſuit* hath writ Annotations on *Facundus*; but when he came to this place he had nothing to ſay, but that the Bread is no Bread, but only the likeneſs and appearance of Bread: An opinion ſo unlike that of *Facundus* that it ſhould not have been Fathered upon him, by a learned and ingenuous man, as *Sirmondus* would be thought to be. For he cannot ſo much as produce any one of the ancient Fathers that ever made mention of accidents ſubſiſting without a ſubject, (called by him the appearances of Bread.) And as for his thinking, *That ſome would take the expreſſions of* Facundus *to*

be ſomewhat uncouth and obſcure, how unjuſt and injurious it is to that learned Father may eaſily be obſerved by any.

Iſid. Hiſp. A.D 630. 26. *Iſidore*, Biſhop of *Hiſpal*, about the begining of the Seventh Century, wrote thus concerning the Sacrament, *Becauſe the bread ſtrengthens our body, therefore it is called the Body of Chriſt, and becauſe the Wine is made bloud, therefore the Bloud of Chriſt is expreſſed by it. Now theſe two are viſible, but yet being ſanctified by the Holy Spirit, they become the Sacraments of the Lords Body. For the Bread which we break is the Body of Chriſt, who ſaid, I am the Bread of life; and the Wine is his Bloud, as it is written, I am the true Vine.* Behold, ſaith he, they become a Sacrament, not the ſubſtance of the Lords Body; for the Bread and Wine which feed our Fleſh cannot be ſubſtantially, nor be ſaid to be the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, but Sacramentally, they are ſo as certainly, as that they are ſo called. But this he declares yet more clearly, *Lib. 6. Etymol. cap. 19. For as the viſible ſubſtance of Bread and Wine nouriſh the outward man; ſo the Word of Chriſt, who is the bread of Life, refreſheth the ſouls of the faithful being received by Faith.* Theſe words were recorded and preſerved by *Bertram* the Prieſt, when as in the Editions of *Iſidore*, they are now left out.

Lib 1. de Off. Eccl. cap. 18.

27. And

27. And the ſame kind of expreſſions as thoſe of *Iſidorus* were alſo uſed by Venerable *Bede* our Country-man, who lived in the Eighth Century, In his Sermon upon the *Epiphany*; of whom we alſo take theſe two teſtimonies following: *In the room of the fleſh and bloud of the Lamb Chriſt ſubſtituted the Sacrament of his Body and Bloud, in the figure of Bread and Wine.* Alſo, *At Supper he gave to his Diſciples the figure of his holy Body and Bloud.* Theſe utterly deſtroy Tranſubſtantiation.

Ven *Bede* *A.D.*720. *Serm. de Epiph.* Com. in Luk.22. Com. in Pſal.3.

28. In the ſame Century, *Charles the Great* wrote an Epiſtle to our *Alcuinus*, wherein we find theſe words. *Chriſt, at Supper broke the bread to his Diſciples, and likewiſe gave them the Cup, in figure of his Body and Bloud, and ſo left to us this great Sacrament for our benefit.* If it was the figure of his body, it could not be the Body it ſelf: Indeed, the Body of Chriſt is given in the Euchariſt, but to the faithful only, and that by means of the Sacrament of the Conſecrated bread.

Car.Mag. *A.D.* 778. *Ep. ad Alcu. de ratione Sept.*

29. But now, about the beginning of the Ninth Century, ſtarted up *Paſchaſius*, a Monk of *Corbie*, who firſt (as ſome ſay, whoſe Judgment I follow not) among the *Latines*, taught that Chriſt was Conſubſtantiated, or rather incloſed in the

Paſch. *A.D.* 818. *Lib. de corp. & ſang Chriſti.*

Bread & corporally united to it in the Sacrament; for as yet there was no thoughts of the Tranſubſtantiation of Bread. But theſe new ſorts of expreſſions not agreeing with the Catholick Doctrine, and the Writings of the ancient Fathers, had few or no Abettors before the Eleventh Century. And in the Ninth, whereof we now treat, there were not wanting learned men (as *Amalarius*, Archdeacon of *Triars*; *Rabanus*, at firſt Abbot of *Fulda*, and afterwards Archbiſhop of *Ments*; *John Erigena*, an *Engliſh* Divine; *Walafridus Strabo*, a *German* Abbot; *Ratramus* or *Bertramus*, firſt Prieſt of *Corbie*, afterwards Abbot of *Orbec* in *France*; and many more) who by their Writings oppoſed this new Opinion of *Paſcaſius*, or of ſome others rather, and delivered to Poſterity the Doctrine of the Ancient Church. Yet we have ſomething more to ſay concerning *Paſchaſius*, whom *Bellarmine* and *Sirmondus* eſteemed ſo highly, that they were not aſhamed to ſay, that he was the firſt that had writ to the purpoſe concerning the Eúchariſt, and that he had ſo explained the meaning of the Church, that he had ſhewn and opened the way to all them who treated of that ſubject after him. Yet in that whole Book of *Paſchaſius*,

Pell. de Scrip Eccleſ. verbo Paſch. Sirm. in vita Paſc. Præf. Editione Pariſienſi.

Paſchaſius, there is nothing that favours the Tranſubſtantiation of the Bread, or its deſtruction or removal. Indeed, he aſſerts the truth of the Body and Bloud of Chriſts being in the Euchariſt, which Proteſtants deny not; he denies that the Conſecrated Bread is a bare figure, a repreſentation void of truth, which Proteſtants aſſert not. But he hath many things repugnant to Tranſubſtantiation, which (as I have ſaid) the Church of *Rome* it ſelf had not yet quite found out. I ſhall mention a few of them. *Chriſt* (ſaith he) *left us this Sacrament, a viſible figure and character of his Body and Bloud, that by them our Spirit might the better embrace ſpiritual and inviſible things, and be more fully fed by Faith.* Again, *We muſt receive our ſpiritual Sacraments with the mouth of the Soul, and the taſte of Faith.* Item. *Whilſt therein we ſavour nothing carnal, but we being ſpiritual, and underſtanding the whole ſpiritually, we remain in Chriſt.* And a little after, *The fleſh and bloud of Chriſt are received ſpiritually.* And again, *To ſavour according to the fleſh, is death; and yet to receive ſpiritually the true Fleſh of Chriſt, is life eternal.* Laſtly, *The Fleſh and bloud of Chriſt are not received carnally, but ſpiritually.* In theſe he teacheth, that the Myſtery of the Lords Supper is

not, and ought not to be underſtood carnally but ſpiritually, and that this dream of corporal and oral Tranſubſtantiation was unknown to the Ancient Church. As for what hath been added to this Book, by the craft (without doubt) of ſome ſuperſtitious forgerer, (as *Eraſmus* complains that it too frequently happens to the Writing of the Ancients,) it is Fabulous, as the viſible appearing of the Body of Chriſt in the form of an Infant with fingers of raw fleſh; ſuch ſtuff is unworthy to be Fathered on *Paſchaſius*, who profeſt that he delivered no other Doctrin concerning the Sacrament, than that which he had learned out of the Ancient Fathers, and not from idle and uncertain ſtories of Miracles.

30. Now it may be requiſite to produce the teſtimony of thoſe Writers before mentioned to have written in this Century. *In all that I write* (ſaith *Amalarius*) *I am ſwayed by the Judgment of holy men and pious Fathers; yet I ſay what I think my ſelf. Thoſe things that are done in the Celebration of Divine Service, are done in the Sacrament of the Paſſion of our Lord as he himſelf commanded. Therefore the Prieſt offering the Bread, with the Wine and Water in the Sacrament, doth it in the ſtead of Chriſt, and the Bread,*

Amal. An. 810.

Præf. in libr de Eccl. offic.

Bread, Wine, and Water in the Sacrament repreſent the Fleſh and Bloud of Chriſt. For Sacraments are ſomewhat to reſemble thoſe things whereof they are Sacraments. Therefore let the Prieſt be like unto Chriſt, as the Bread and Liquors are like the Body and Bloud of Chriſt. Such is in ſome manner the immolation of the Prieſt on the Altar, as was that of Chriſt on the Croſs. Again, *The Sacrament of the Body of Chriſt, is in ſome manner the Body of Chriſt: For Sacraments ſhould not be Sacraments, if in ſome things they had not the likeneſs of that whereof they are Sacraments: Now by reaſon of this mutual likeneſs, they oftentimes are called by what they repreſent.* Laſtly, *Sacraments have the vertue to bring us to thoſe things whereof they are Sacraments.* Theſe things writ *Amalarius* according to the Expreſſions of St. *Auſtin*, and the Doctrine of the pureſt Church.

31. *Rabanus Maurus*, a great Doctor of this Age, *Who could hardly be matcht either in* Italy *or in* Germany, publiſht this his open Confeſſion: *Our bleſſed Saviour would have the Sacrament of his Body and Bloud, to be received by the mouth of the Faithful, and to become their nouriſhment, that by the viſible body, the effects of the inviſible might be known: For as the material Food feeds the body outwardly, and makes it to grow, ſo the*

Raban. A. D. 825. Trithem. de Script. Eccl. Rabanus Maur. de Inſt. Cler. l. 1. c. 31.

Word of God doth inwardly nouriſh and ſtrengthen the ſoul. Alſo, *He would have the Sacramental Elements to be made of the fruits of the earth, that as he, who is God inviſible, appeared viſible in our Fleſh, and mortal to ſave us mortals, ſo he might by a thing viſible fitly repreſent to us a thing inviſible. Some receive the Sacred Sign at the Lords Table to their Salvation, and ſome to their Ruine; but the thing ſignified is life to every man, and death to none, whoever receives it is united as a member to Chriſt the head in the Kingdom of Heaven; for the Sacrament is one thing, and the efficacy of it another: For the Sacrament is received with the mouth, but the grace thereof feeds the inward man. And as the firſt is turned into our ſubſtance when we eat it and drink it, ſo are we made the Body of Chriſt when we live piouſly and obediently. —— Therefore the Faithful do well and truly receive the body of Chriſt, if they neglect not to be his members, and they are made the Body of Chriſt if they will live of his Spirit.* All theſe agree not in the leaſt with the new Doctrine of *Rome*, and as little with that opinion they attribute to *Paſchaſius*, and therefore he is rejected as erroneous by ſome *Romiſh* Authors, who writ four and ſix hundred years after him: But they ſhould have conſidered that they condemned not only *Rabanus*, but together with

G. Malm. A. 1100. and Tho. Wald. A. 1400.

with him all the Doctors of the Primitive Church.

32. *Johannes Erigena* our Country-man, (whom King *Alfred* took to be his, and his Childrens Tutor, and to credit the new founded Univerſity of *Oxford*) while he lived in *France*, where he was in great eſteem with *Charles the Bald*, wrote (*a*) a Book concerning the Body and Bloud of our Lord, to the ſame purpoſe as *Rabanus*, and back'd it with clear Teſtimonies of Scripture and of the Holy Fathers. But entring himſelf into the Monaſtery of *Malmsbury*, as he was interpreting the Book of *Dyoniſius* about the heavenly Hierarchy, (which he tranſlated into Latine) and withal cenſuring the newly-hatcht Doctrine of the Carnal Preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, he was ſtabb'd (*b*) with Pen-knives by ſome unworthy Schollars of his, ſet on by certain Monks; though not long after, he was by ſome (*c*) others numbred among Holy Martyrs. *Joh. Erig. A.* 860.

a That Book was afterwards condemned under *Leo* IX. two hundred years after by the maintainers of Tranſubſtantiation.

b Anton. *tit. c.* 2. §. 3. Vincent. *l.* 24 *c.* 42. *& alii.*

c Malmſ. *de geſtis Reg. Angl. l.* 2.

33. *Walafridus Strabo*, about the ſame time wrote on this manner. *Therefore in that Laſt Supper whereat Chriſt was with his Diſciples before he was betrayed; after the ſolemnities of the ancient Paſſeover, he gave to his* *Wal. Stra.* 860. *De rebus Eccl. c.* 16.

his Disciples the Sacrament of his Body and Bloud in the substance of Bread and Wine, — and instructed us to pass from carnal to spiritual things, from earthly to heavenly things, and from shadows to the substance.

Bertram Priest and Abbot, *A.*860.

34. As for the opinion of *Bertram*, otherwise called *Ratramnus*, or *Ratramus*, perhaps not rightly, it is known enough by that Book which the Emperour *Charles the Bald* (who loved and honoured him, as all good men did, for his great learning and piety) commanded him to write concerning the Body and Bloud of our Lord. For when men began to be disturbed at the Book of *Paschasius*, some saying one thing, and some another, the Emperour being moved by their disputes propounded himself two questions to *Bertram*. 1. Whether, what the Faithful eat in the Church, be made the Body and Bloud of Christ in Figure and in Mystery? 2. Or whether that natural body which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, which suffered, died, and was buried, and now sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, be it self dayly received by the mouth of the Faithful in the Mystery of the Sacrament? The first of these *Bertram* resolved Affirmatively, the second Negatively, and said, that there was as great a difference

rence betwixt thoſe two bodies, as betwixt the earneſt and that whereof it is the earneſt. *It is evident* (ſaith he) *that that Bread and Wine are figuratively the Body and Bloud of Chriſt.* — *According to the ſubſtance of the Elements, they are after the Conſecration what they were before.* — *For the Bread is not Chriſt ſubſtantially.* — *If this myſtery be not done in a figure, it cannot well be called a Myſtery.* — *The Wine alſo which is made the Sacrament of the Bloud of Chriſt by the Conſecration of the Prieſt, ſhews one thing by its outward appearance and contains another inwardly. For what is there viſible in its outſide but only the ſubſtance of the Wine? Theſe things are changed, but not according to the material part, and by this change they are not what they truly appear to be, but are ſome thing elſe beſides what is their proper being: For they are made ſpiritually the Body and Bloud of Chriſt; not that the Elements be two different things, but in one reſpect they are, as they appear, Bread and Wine, and in another the Body and Bloud of Chriſt.* — *Hence, according to the viſible Creature they feed the body, but according to the vertue of a more excellent ſubſtance they nouriſh and ſanctifie the ſouls of the Faithful.* Then having brought many Teſtimonies of holy Scripture and the ancient Fathers to confirm this, he at laſt prevents that Calumny

Lib. de corp. & Sang Dom part. 1.
Ibid. Part. 2.

lumny which the followers of *Paſchaſius* did then lay on the Orthodox, as though they had taught that bare ſigns, figures, and ſhadows, and not the Body and Bloud of Chriſt were given in the Sacrament, *Let it not be thought* (ſaith he) *becauſe we ſay this, that therefore the Body and Bloud of Chriſt are not received in the Myſtery of the Sacrament, where Faith apprehends what it believes, and not what the eyes ſee; for this meat and drink are ſpiritual, feed the ſoul ſpiritually, and entertain that life whoſe fulneſs is eternal.*. For the queſtion is not ſimply about the real truth, or the thing ſignified being preſent, without which it could not be a Myſtery, but about the falſe reality of things ſubſiſting in imaginary appearances, and about the Carnal Preſence.

Index lib. prob. in fine Concil. Trid. Author. Papæ editus in Lit. B.

35. All this the Fathers of *Trent*, and the *Romiſh* Inquiſitors could not brook, and therefore they utterly condemned *Bertram*, and put his Book in the Catalogue of thoſe that are forbidden. But the Profeſſors of *Doway* judging this proceeding much too violent, and therefore more like to hurt than to advance the *Roman* Cauſe, went another and more cunning way to work, and had the approbation of the Licencers of Books, and the

the Authors of the *Belgick Index expurgatorius*. *That Book of* Bertram (ſay they) *having been already Printed ſeveral times, read by many, and known to all by its being forbidden, may be ſuffered and uſed after it is corrected; for* Bertram *was a Catholick Prieſt and a Monk in the Monaſtery of* Corbie, *eſteemed and beloved by* Charles the Bald. *And being we bear with many errors in Ancient Catholick Authors, and leſſen, and excuſe them, and* by ſome cunning device (behold the good mens fidelity!) *often deny them, and give a more commodious ſenſe, when they are objected to us in our diſputes with our Adverſaries; we do not ſee why* Bertram *ſhould not alſo be amended and uſed with the ſame Equity, leſt Hereticks caſt us in the teeth, that we burn and ſuppreſs thoſe Records of Antiquity that make for them: And, as we alſo fear, leſt, not only Hereticks, but alſo ſtubborn Catholicks read the Book with the more greedineſs, and cite it with the more confidence becauſe it is forbidden, and ſo it doth more harm by being prohibited than if it was left free.* What patch then will they ſow to amend this in *Bertram*? *Thoſe things that differ are not the ſame; that Body of Chriſt which died and roſe again, and is become immortal, dies no more, being eternal and impaſſable: But that which is celebrated in the Church, is temporal, not eternal; is corruptible,*

Index expur. Belg. juſſu & author. Phil 2. Hiſp Reg. atque Albani ducis concilio concinn. p 54. v. Bert.

ruptible, and not incorruptible. To this laſt mentioned paſſage, they give a very commodious ſenſe, namely, *that it ſhould be underſtood of the corruptible ſpecies of the Sacrament, or of the Sacrament it ſelf, and the uſe of it, which will laſt no longer than this world.* If this will not do, it may not be amiſs to leave it all out; to blot out *viſibly*, and write *inviſibly*. And this, *What the Creatures were in ſubſtance before the Conſecration, they are ſtill the ſame after it*, muſt be underſtood, according to *the outward appearances*, that is, *the accidents of the Bread and Wine. Though they confeſs that then* Bertram *knew nothing of thoſe accidents ſubſiſting without a ſubſtance, and many other things which this latter age hath added out of the Scriptures with as great truth as ſubtilty.* How much eaſier had it been at one ſtroke to blot out the whole Book? And ſo make ſhort work with it, as the *Spaniſh* Inquiſitors did in their *Index expurgat. Let the whole Epiſtle* (ſay they) *of* Udalricus, Biſhop of Ausburg *be blotted out, cencerning the ſingle life of the Clergy; and let the whole Book of* Bertram *the Prieſt, about the Body and Bloud of the Lord, be ſuppreſt.* What is this, but, as *Arnobius* ſaid againſt the Heathen, *to intercept publick Records, and fear the Teſtimony of the Truth?* For, as for that which

Index expur. Hiſp. D. Gaſp. Quirogæ, Card & Inquiſ. gener. in fine.

Arnob. l 3.

Sixtus

Sixtus Senenſis, and *Poſſevin* affirm, That that Book of the Body and Bloud of the Lord was writ by *Oecolampadius* under the name of *Bertram*, it is ſo great an untruth, that a greater cannot be found. *Sixt. Sen. præf. in Bibl. Sanc. Poſſev. Prol. in Appa. Sac.*

36. We are now come to the tenth Century, wherein, beſides thoſe many Sentences of Catholick Fathers againſt Innovaters in what concerns the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, collected by *Herigerus Abbas Lobienſis*, we have alſo an ancient *Eaſter* Homily in *Saxon-Engliſh*, which then uſed to be read publickly in our Churches: out of which we may gather what was then the Doctrine received amongſt us, touching this Point of Religion; but chiefly out of that part wherein are ſhewn many differences betwixt the natural Body of Chriſt and the Conſecrated Hoſt. For thus it teacheth the people, *There is a great difference betwixt that body wherein Chriſt ſuffered and that wherein the Hoſt is conſecrated. That Body, wherein Chriſt ſuffered was born of the Virgin* Mary, *conſiſting of bloud and bones, skin and nerves, humane members, and a rational ſoul: But his ſpiritual body which we call the Hoſt, is made of many united grains of corn, and hath neither bloud nor bones, neither members nor ſoul.* Afterwards, *The Body of Chriſt, which once died* *Herig. Ab. A. D. 930.* *Hom. Paſc. Angl. Sax. A. D. 990. impreſſa Lond. & MS. in publ. Cant. Acad. Bib.*

died and roſe again, ſhall die no more, but remains eternal and impaſſible; but this Hoſt is temporal and corruptible, divided into parts broken with the teeth, and ſwallowed down into the ſtomach. Laſtly, this Myſtery is a pledge and a figure: The body of Chriſt is that very truth. What is ſeen is bread, but what is ſpiritually underſtood is life. There is alſo another Sermon of Biſhop *Wulfinus* to the Clergy, bearing the title of a Synod of Prieſts, wherein the ſame opinion and Doctrine is explained in this manner: *That Hoſt is the Body of Chriſt, not corporally, but ſpiritually; not that Body wherein he ſuffered, but that Body whereof he ſpake, when he conſecrated the Bread and Wine into an Hoſt.* Which to this day, in the Church of *England* we hold to be a Catholick truth.

Homil. Sacerd Synod. impr. Lond. cum Homil. Paſchali.

37. And ſo hitherto we have produced the agreeing Teſtimonies of Ancient Fathers for a thouſand years after Chriſt, and have tranſcribed them more at large, to make it appear to every one that is not blind, that the true Apoſtolick Doctrine of this Myſtery, hath been univerſally maintained for ſo long by all men; ſome few excepted, who more than eight hundred years after Chriſt preſumed to diſpute againſt the ancient Orthodox Doctrine, of the manner of Chriſts Preſence, and of his

his being received in the Sacrament, though they durst not positively determine any thing against it. Now, what more concerns this Point we refer to the next Chapter, lest this should be too long.

CHAP. VI.

Shews more at large that the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Church is inconsistent with Transubstantiation; and Answers the Romish Objections vainly alleadged out of Antiquity.

1. MAny more Proofs out of Ancient Records might have been added to those we have hitherto brought, for a thousand years, but we, desiring to be brief, have omitted them in each Century; As in the First, After the holy Scriptures, the Works of [a] *Clemens Romanus*, commended by the Papists themselves, and those of [b] St. *Ignatius*, Bishop of *Antioch* and Martyr, are much against Transubstantiation. In the Second likewise, [c] St. *Theophilus*, fourth Bishop of *Antioch* after

Authors left out in the foregoing Chapter.

a *Constit. Ap l. 6. c. 23. & 29*

b *Epist ad Philadel.*

c *Ad Autol. l. 2.*

after *Ignatius*; [d] *Athenagoras*, and [e] *Tatianus*, Scholars to *Justin Martyr*. In the Third, [f] *Clemens Alexandrinus*, Tutor to *Origen*, and [g] *Minutius Felix*, a Christian Orator. In the Fourth, [h] *Eusebius*, Bishop of *Cesarea*, [i] *Juvencus*, a *Spanish* Priest, [k] *Macarius Egyptius*, [l] St. *Hilary*, Bishop of *Poictiers*, [m] *Optatus*, Bishop of *Milevis*, [n] *Eusebius Emissenus*, [o] *Gregorius Nazianzenus*, [p] *Cyrillus Alexandrinus*, [q] *Epiphanius Salaminensis*, [r] St. *Hierom*, [s] *Theophilus Alexandrinus*, and [t] *Gaudentius*, Bishop of *Brixia*. In the Fifth, [u] *Sedulius*, a Scotch Priest, [x] *Gennadius Massilienſis*, and [y] *Faustus*, Bishop of *Regium*. In the Sixth, [z] *Fulgentius Africanus*, [a] *Victor Antiochenus*, [b] *Primasius* Bishop, and [c] *Procopius Gazeus*. In the Seventh, [d] *Hesychius*, Priest in *Jerusalem*, and [e] *Maximus*, Abbot of *Constantinople*. In the Eighth, [f] *Johannes Damascenus*. In the Ninth, [g] *Nicephorus* the Patriarch, and [h] *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rhemes*. Lastly in the Tenth, [i] *Fulbert* Bishop of *Chartres*. And to compleat all; to these single Fathers, we may add whole Councils of them, as

a *Athenag legat. pro Christ.*
e *In Diatess.*
f *De Strol. 1. & de pædag. l. 2.*
g *In Octavio.*
h *De Dem. Evan. l 1. c. 10. & l. 8. c. 2.*
i *Juv. de Hist. Evang. l. 4.*
k *Mac. Hom. 37.*
l *In Mat. & de Syn.*
m *Contra Parm. l. 3.*
n *Hom. de Corp. Chr.*
o *Orat. fun. Greg.*
p *In Joh. l. 4. c. 14.*
q *In Ancorato*
r *Contra Jovin. & in Jer. 31. & in Mat. 26.*

s *Epist. Pasch. 2* t *Gaud. in Exod 2.* u *In Epist. St Paul.* x *De Dogm. Eccl. c. 25.* y *Homil. 2. in Epipb.* z *De fide cap 16. & Epist. ad Ferrand.* a *Com. in Mark 14.* b *In Epist. ad Cor.* c *In Gen. c 9.* d *In Levit. l. 6.* e *In Hierarch Dion.* f *De fide Orthod.* g *De Cherub c. 6.* h *In vita S. Remig.* i *Epist. ad Adeodat.*

that

that of [k] *Ancyra*, of [l] *Neocesarea*, and besides the first of [m] *Nice* which I have mentioned, that of [n] *Laodicea*, of [o] *Carthage*, of [p] *Orleans*, the fourth of [q] *Toledo*, that of [r] *Bracara*, the sixteenth of [s] *Toledo*, and that of [t] *Constantinople* in *Trullo*. Out of all these appears most certain, that the infection of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation was not yet spread over the Christian world; but that the sound Doctrine of the Body and Bloud of Christ, and of their true (yet spiritual not carnal) Presence in the Eucharist, with the Elements, still the same in substance after Consecration, was every where owned and maintained. And though the Fathers used both ways of speaking (that is, that the Bread and Wine are the true Body and Bloud of Christ, and that their substance still remaining, they are Signs, Types, Resemblances, and Pledges of them; Images, Figures, Similitudes, Representations, and Samplers of them,) yet there was no cantrariety or diversity in the sense. For they were not so Faithless as to believe that these are only naturall Elements, or bare Signs; and they were not of so gross and so dull an apprehension, as not to distin-

k *An.*314. *Can.*2.
l *A. eodem. Can.* 13.
m *In Act. l.* 2. *Can.*30.
n *A.*364. *Can.*25.
o *A.*397. *Can.*24.
p *A.*541. *Can.*4.
q *A.*633. *Can.*17.
r *A.*675. *Can.*2.
s *A.*693. *Can.*6.
t *A.*691. *Can.*32.

diſtinguiſh betwixt the Sacramental and Myſtick, and the carnal and natural preſence of Chriſt, as it is now maintained by the Patrons of Tranſubſtantiation. For in this they underſtood no other change than that which is common to all Sacraments, whereby the outward natural part is ſaid to be changed into the inward and divine, only becauſe it repreſents it truly and efficaciouſly, and makes all worthy Receivers partakers thereof; and becauſe by the vertue of the Holy Spirit, and of Chriſt's holy inſtitution, the Elements obtain thoſe divine Excellencies and Prerogatives, which they cannot have of their own nature. And this is it which was taught and believed, for above a thouſand years together, by pious and learned Antiquity, concerning this moſt holy Myſtery.

2. There are alſo ſome other things whereby we may underſtand that the Ancients did not belief *Tranſubſtantiation*, or that the preſence of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt is ſo inſeparably tyed to the accidents of Bread and Wine, that Chriſt muſt needs be preſent as long as thoſe accidents retain any reſemblance of Bread and Wine, even when they are not put to that uſe appointed by divine inſtitution.

For

For it is certain, that it was the cuſtom of many of the Ancients *to burn what remained of the Bread and Wine after the Comunion was ended.* And who can believe that any Chriſtian ſhould dare or be willing to burn his Lord and Saviour, in Body and Bloud, though it were never ſo much in his power? Doubtleſs it would have been as horrid and deteſtable an action as was that of the perfidious Jews, for Chriſtians, if they believed *Tranſubſtantiation*, to burn that very natural body which the Jews Crucified, and which was born of the Virgin *Mary.* Therefore thoſe Chriſtians who uſed anciently to burn thoſe fragments of the Bread, and remains of the Wine, which were not ſpent in the celebration of the Sacrament, were far enough from holding the preſent Faith and Doctrine of *Rome.* The ſame appears further by the penalty threatned by the Canon to every Clergy-man, *by whoſe neglect a Mouſe or any other Creature ſhould eat the Sacrifice,* (that is, the Conſecrated Bread.) And who but an Idiot, a man deprived of his reaſon, could ever believe that the natural Body of Chriſt can be gnawed and even eaten by Rats, or any brute Creatures?

Heſych. l. 2. in Levit. cap. 8. A D. 600.

Concil. Argl. Septim. tredecimus inter eos qui Bedæ titulum præferunt, A D. 700. & ſub Edgaro Rege 38. Ibid A.D. 970.

Conc. Arelat. 2. Citat. à Gratiano de Conſecr. diſt. 2. A. D. 640.

This ſorely perplext the firſt maintainers of *Tranſubſtantiation*, who would invent any thing, rather than own it poſſible; well knowing how abominable it is, and how diſhonourable to Chriſtian Religion. Yet this is not inconſiſtent with the now Roman Faith; nay, it neceſſarily follows from the Tenet of *Tranſubſtantiation* that the Body of Chriſt may be in the belly of a Mouſe [a] under the accidents of Bread. And the contrary opinion is not only diſowned now by the Papiſts, but under pain of Excommunication forbidden by the [b] Pope ever to be owned; ſo that they muſt believe as an Article of Faith [c], what is moſt abhorrent to Faith.

a *Alex. Aleſ. lib.* 4. *q.*45. *m.*1. *art.* 2. *& q.*53. *m.* 3. *Thom. in* 3. *q.*80. *art.*3. *& in* 4. *d*,9. *q.*2.

b *Greg.*XI. *in director. Inquiſ. p.* 1. *n.* 15. *& p* 2. *q.*10.

c *Vaſq diſp.*195. *in* 3. *c.*5.

3. But yet at laſt, let us ſee what props theſe new builders pretend to borrow from Antiquity to uphold their Caſtle in the air, *Tranſubſtantiation*. They uſe indeed to ſcrape together many Teſtimonies of the Fathers of the firſt and middle age, whereby they would fain prove, that thoſe Fathers believed and taught the *Tranſubſtantiation* of the Bread and Wine into the natural Body and Bloud of Chriſt, juſt as the Roman Church, at this day, doth teach and believe. We will therefore briefly

briefly examine them, that it may yet more fully appear that Antiquity and all Fathers did not in the least favour the new Tenet of Transubstantiation; but that, that true Doctrin which I have set down in the begining of this book, was constantly owned and preserved in the Church of Christ.

4. Now, almost all that they produce out of the Fathers will be conveniently reduced to certain heads, that we may not be too tedious in answering each testimony by it self.

5. To the first head belong those [d] that call the Eucharist the Body and Bloud of Christ. But I answer, those Fathers explain themselves in many places, and interpret those their expressions in such a manner, that they must be understood in a Mystick and spiritual sense, in that Sacraments usually take the names of those things they represent, because of that resemblance which they have with them; [e] *not by the reality of the thing, but by the signification of the Mystery*, as we have shewn before out of St. *Austin* and others. For no body can deny, but that the things that are seen are signs and figures, and those that are not seen, the Body and Bloud of Christ: And that therefore the nature of this mystery is such, that when we receive

d Answer to the Allegations out of *Iren. Orig. Cyril Hier. Gre. Naz. St. Hier. St. Austin* and others.

e *De Consecr dist 2. c ficut.*

the Bread and Wine, we alſo together with them receive at the ſame time the body and Bloud of Chriſt, which in the celebration of the holy Euchariſt, are as truly given as they are repreſented. Hence came into the Church this manner of ſpeaking, the Conſecrated Bread is Chriſts Body.

An Anſwer to the proofs out of St. *Hier. Ep. ad Heliod.* 2. & *ad Evag.* 85. & St. *Ambr. de iis qui init. c.* 9. &c.

6. We put in the ſecond rank thoſe places that ſay, that the Biſhops and Prieſts make the body of Chriſt with the ſacred words of their mouth, as St. *Hierom* ſpeaks in his Epiſtle to *Heliodorus*, and St. *Ambroſe* and others. To this I ſay, that at the prayer and bleſſing of the Prieſt, the common Bread is made Sacramental bread, which, when broken and eaten is the *Communion* of the body of Chriſt, and therefore may well be called ſo, Sacramentally. For the bread (as I have often ſaid before) doth not only repreſent the body of our Lord, but alſo being received, we are truly made partakers of that precious body. For ſo ſaith S. *Hier. The body and bloud of Chriſt is made at the Prayer of the Prieſt*, that is, the Element is ſo qualified that being received it becomes the Communion of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, which it could not without the preceding Prayers. The *Greeks* call this, *To prepare and to conſecrate the Body of the Lord.* As S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith well,

Ep. 85. *ad Evag.*

St. Chryſ. Hom. 83. *in St. Mat.*

Theſe

Theſe are not the works of mans power, but ſtill the operation of him, who made them in the laſt Supper; as for us, we are only Miniſters, but he it is that ſanctifies and changeth them.

7. In the third place, to what is brought out of the Fathers, concerning the converſion, change, tranſmutation, transfiguration, and tranſelementation of the Bread and Wine in the Euchariſt, (wherein the Papiſts do greatly glory, boaſting of the conſent of Antiquity with them;) I anſwer that there is no ſuch conſequence, Tranſubſtantiation being another ſpecies of change, the enumeration was not full, for it doth not follow, that becauſe there is a converſion, a tranſmutation, a tranſelementation, there ſhould be alſo a Tranſubſtantiation; which the Fathers never ſo much as mentioned. For becauſe this is a Sacrament, the change muſt be underſtood to be Sacramental alſo, whereby common Bread and Wine become the Sacrament of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, which could not be did not the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine remain, for a Sacrament conſiſteth of two parts, an earthly and a heavenly. And ſo becauſe ordinary Bread is changed by conſecration into a Bread which is no more of common uſe, but appointed

An Anſwer to what is cited out of St. *Cyp. Ambroſe*, both the *Cyrills Chryſ. Gre. Nyſſ. & aliorum.*

appointed by divine inſtitution to be a Sacramental ſign whereby is repreſented the Body of Chriſt, in whom dwelleth the fulneſs of the Godhead bodily; and being thereby dignified, having great excellencies ſuperadded, and ſo made what it was not before, it is therefore ſaid by ſome of the Fathers to be changed, to be made another thing. And truly that change is great and ſupernatural, but yet not ſubſtantial, not of a ſubſtance which ſubſtantially ceaſeth to be, into another ſubſtance which ſubſtantially beginneth to be, but it is a change of ſtate and condition which alters not the natural properties of the Element. This is alſo confirmed by Scripture, which uſually deſcribes and repreſents the converſion of men, and the ſupernatural change of things, as though it were natural, though it be not ſo. So thoſe that are renewed by the Word, and Spirit, and Faith of Chriſt, are ſaid to be [a] regenerated, converted, and transformed, to put off the old man, and put on the new man, and to be new Creatures; but they are not ſaid to become another ſubſtance, to be tranſubſtantiated: For men thus converted have ſtill the ſame humane body, and the ſame rational ſoul as before, though in a far better

[a] Joh. 3. 3. 1 Pet. 1. 3. 1 Cor. 4. 15. Rom. 12. 2. Eph. 4. 22. Gal. 6. 15.

better ſtate and condition, as every Chriſtian will acknowledge. Nay, the Fathers themſelves uſe thoſe words, Tranſmutation, Transformation, Tranſelementations, upon other occaſions, when they ſpeak of things whoſe ſubſtance is neither loſt nor changed. For thoſe words be of ſo large a ſignification, that though ſometimes a ſubſtantial change is to be underſtood by them, yet for the moſt part they ſignifie only a moral change, a change of qualities, of condition, of office, of uſe, and the like. To this ſenſe they are uſed by the Greek Fathers, ([a] *Irenæus*, [b] *Clemens Alexandrinus*, [c] *Origene*, [d] *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, [e] *Baſil*, [f] *Gregory Nazianzen*, [g] *Gregory Nyſſene*, [h] *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, [i] *Chryſoſtom*, [k] *Theodoret*, *Theophylact*, and *Oecumenius*,) to expreſs the [a] Reſurrection of the Body, the efficacy [b] of divine Doctrine, the Sanctification of a [c] regenerated perſon, the immortality [d] of the fleſh after the Reſurrection, the [e] repentance of ſinners, the [f] aſſumption of the humane nature in the Perſon of Chriſt, the [g] regeneration of

a *Iren. l. 5. c.* 10.
b *Clem. Alex. l. 4. Strom.*
c *Orig. Serm. 2. in diverſos.*
d *Cyril. Hier. Catech.* 18.
e *Baſil. exhort. ad Bapt. & S. Chryſ. hom. 5. de Pœnit.*

f *Greg. Naz. Orat* 40. g *Greg. Nyſſ. lib* 2. *contra Eunom. Hom.* 1. *de Reſur. Ep. ad Euſtath. Latin. & Ambroſ.* h *Cyril. Alexand. Epiſt. Paſch.* 6, 7. *&* 14. i *S. Chryſoſt. Hom.* 23. *in Act. Apoſt. Idem Hom.* 33. *in* 1 *Cor.* k *Theod. Dial.* 2. *Theoph. in Job* 6. *& Oecum in* 1 *Pet.* 1. *& alii.*

Saints,

Saints, the [h] vertue of the divine grace, the power of Baptiſm [i], and the excellency of Charity, and laſtly the [k] alteration for the better, the greatneſs, uſefulneſs, power and dignity of many things. Neither are the Latine [l] Fathers without ſuch kind of expreſſions, for they do not make the converſion of the Bread and Wine in the Euchariſt more eſſential or ſubſtantial, than in Baptiſm the converſion of man born again to a new life, or (as they ſpeak) whoſe humane natural condition is changed into a nobler, a heavenly ſtate, which is a moral and myſtick change, and not natural or ſubſtantial. The Ancienteſt of them, [m] *Tertullian* ſaid, *That God had promiſed to man the body and ſubſtance of Angels, and that men ſhould be transformed into Angels, as Angels have been transformed into men.* Now, who would infer from hence, that Angels have been eſſentially changed into men; or that humane bodies ſhould be ſo transformed into an Angelical ſubſtance, that they ſhould be no longer men nor humane bodies, but properly and eſſentially Angels? Which *Tertullian* himſelf is expreſly againſt, and ſaith, *That Angels were ſo changed into men that ſtill they remained Angels,*

[i] *St. Auſtin. l. 4. contra Creſcon. cap. 54. St. Ambr. de Myſt. c. 9. & de Sacr. l. 4. c. 4. Fauſt. Reg. ſive Euſ. Emiſſ. de Paſch. 55. Facund. l. 9. c. ult.*

[m] *Contra Marc. l. 3. c. 9. 24. & 26.*

De Carne Chriſti. cap 3.

Angels, without quitting their proper ſubſtance. As others have ſpoken of the Bread in the Euchariſt, *That it ſo becomes the body of Chriſt, that ſtill it is what it was*, as St. *Ambroſe*; *That it looſeth not its nature*, as *Theodoret*; that the ſubſtance of the Bread remains, as *Gelaſius* affirms. And doubtleſs the ſame meant all the Ancients, who according to their way of ſpeaking ſaid any thing of the change of Bread and Wine. For all the Vouchers brought by the Papiſts ſpeak only of an accidental, myſtical, and moral; nothing at all of a ſubſtantial change. Tranſubſtantiation is taken by its defenders for a material change of one ſubſtance into another; we indeed allow a Tranſmutation of the Elements; but as for a ſubſtantial one we vainly ſeek for it, it is no where to be found.

Superius citati.

8. To the fourth head I refer what the Fathers ſay of our touching and ſeeing the Body of Chriſt, and drinking his Bloud in the Sacrament, and thereto I anſwer, That we deny not but that ſome things Emphatical and even Hyperbolical have been ſaid of the Sacrament by *Chryſoſtome*, and ſome others; and that thoſe things may eaſily lead unwary men into error. That was the ancient Fathers care, as it is ours ſtill, to inſtruct the people not

Anſwer to the Teſtimonies of S *Chryſ. Cyril. Alex.* and others.

to

to look barely on the outward Elements, but in them to eye with their minds the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, and with their *hearts lift up* to feed on that heavenly meat: For all the benefit of a Sacrament is loſt, if we look no farther than the Elements. Hence it is that thoſe holy men, the better to teach this Leſſon to their hearers, and move their hearts more efficaciouſly, ſpake of the Signs as if they had been the thing ſignified, and like Orators ſaid many things which will not bear a litteral ſenſe, nor a ſtrict examen. Such is this, of an uncertain Author under the name of St. *Cyprian, We are cloſe to the Croſs, we ſuck the bloud, and we put our tongues in the very wounds of our Redeemer, ſo that, both outwardly and inwardly we are made red thereby.* Such is that of [a] St. *Chryſoſtome, In the Sacrament the Bloud is drawn out of the ſide of Chriſt, the* [b] *Tongue is made bloudy with that wonderful bloud.* Again, [c] *Thou ſeeſt thy Lord ſacrificed, and the crouding multitude round about ſprinkled with his bloud; he that ſits above with the Father is at the ſame time in our hands.* [d] *Thou doſt ſee and touch and eat him.* [e] *For I do not ſhew thee either Angels or Archangels, but the Lord of them himſelf.* Again, [f] *He incorporates us with himſelf as if we were but the ſame thing, he makes*

Serm. de Cœn. Dom.

a *Hom. in Encœn.*
b *Hom. 82. in Mat.*
c *Lib. de Sacerd. 3.*
d *Hom. 51 & 83. in Mat.*
e *Hom. 24. 1 Cor.*
f *Hom. 46. in Joh. & 83. in Mat.*

makes us his body indeed, and ſuffers us not only to ſee, but even to touch, to eat him, and to put our teeth in his fleſh; ſo that by that food which he gives us, we become his fleſh. Such is that of St. *Auſtin, Let us give thanks, not only that we are made Chriſtians, but alſo made Chriſt.* Laſtly, ſuch is that of B. *Leo, In that myſtical diſtribution, it is given us to be made his fleſh.* Certainly, if any man would wrangle and take advantage of theſe, he might thereby maintain, as well that we are *Tranſubſtantiated* into Chriſt, and Chriſts fleſh into the Bread, as that the Bread and Wine are *Tranſubſtantiated* into his Body and Bloud. But Proteſtants who ſcorn to play the Sophiſters, interpret theſe and the like paſſages of the Fathers, with candour and ingenuity, (as it is moſt fitting they ſhould.) For the expreſſions of Preachers, which often have ſomething of a Paradox, muſt not be taken according to that harſher ſound wherewith they at firſt ſtrike the Auditors ears; the Fathers ſpake not of any Tranſubſtantiated bread, but of the myſtical and conſecrated, when they uſed thoſe ſorts of expreſſions; and that for theſe Reaſons: 1. That they might extoll and amplifie the dignity of this Myſtery, which all true Chriſtians acknowledge to be very

Tract. 21. in Joh.

Epiſt. 23.

very great and peerleſs. 2. That Communicants might not reſt in the outward Elements, but ſeriouſly conſider the thing repreſented, whereof they are moſt certainly made partakers, if they be worthy Receivers. 3. And laſtly, That they might approach ſo great a Myſtery with the more zeal, reverence, and devotion. And that thoſe Hyperbolick expreſſions are thus to be underſtood, the Fathers themſelves teach clearly enough, when they come to interpret them.

9. Laſtly, Being the ſame holy Fathers who (as the manner is to diſcourſe of Sacraments) ſpeak ſometimes of the Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper, as if they were the very Body and Bloud of Chriſt, do alſo very often call them Types, Elements, Signs, the Figure of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt; from hence it appears moſt manifeſtly that they were of the Proteſtants, and not of the Papiſts opinion. For we can without prejudice to what we believe of the Sacrament, uſe thoſe former expreſſions which the Papiſts believe, do moſt favour them, if they be underſtood, as they ought to be, Sacramentally. But the latter none can uſe, but he muſt thereby overthrow the groundleſs Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation; theſe

two,

two, the Bread is Tranſubſtantiated into the Body, and the Bread alſo is the Type, the Sign, the Figure of the body of Chriſt being wholly inconſiſtent. For it is impoſſible that a thing that loſeth its being ſhould yet be the ſign and repreſentation of another; neither can any thing be the Type and the Sign of it ſelf.

10. But if without admitting of a Sacramental ſenſe the words be uſed too rigorouſly, nothing but this will follow, that the Bread and Wine are really and properly the very Body and Bloud of Chriſt, which they themſelves diſown, that hold Tranſubſtantiation. Therefore in this change, it is not a newneſs of ſubſtance, but of uſe and vertue that is produced; which yet the Fathers acknowledged with us, to be wonderful, ſupernatural, and proper only to Gods Omnipotency: For that earthly and corruptible meat cannot become to us a ſpiritual and heavenly, the Communion of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, without Gods eſpecial power and operation. And whereas it is far above Philoſophy and Humane Reaſon, that Chriſt from Heaven (where alone he is locally) ſhould reach down to us the divine vertue of his Fleſh, ſo that we are made one body with

him; therefore it is as neceſſary as it is reaſonable, that the Fathers ſhould tell us, that we ought with ſingleneſs of heart to believe the Son of God, when he ſaith, *This is my body*; and that we ought not to meaſure this high and holy Myſtery by our narrow conceptions, or by the courſe of nature. For it is more acceptable to God with an humble ſimplicity of faith to reverence and embrace the words of Chriſt, than to wreſt them violently to a ſtrange and improper ſenſe, and with curioſity and preſumption to determine what exceeds the capacity of Men and Angels. Thus much in general may ſuffice to anſwer thoſe places of the Fathers, which are uſually brought in the behalf of Tranſubſtantiation. He that would have a larger refutation of thoſe objections fetcht from Antiquity, may read *Hoſpinianus* his Hiſtory of the Sacrament, and *Antonius de Dominis* in his Fifth Book of the Chriſtian Commonwealth, Chap. 6. and in his detection of the errors of *Suarez*, Chap. 2.

Lib. 2. & 4. A Sect. 1. uſque ad 13.

Anſwer to ſingle teſtimony of Fathers.

11. That place of *Ignatius* cited by *Theodoret*, out of the Epiſtle to the *Smyrnenſes* (where now it is not to be found) and objected by ſome of the Romiſh Faith, *That the Hereticks* Simoniani *and* Menandriani

Dial. 3. ex Ep. 5. Ignat.

driani *would have no Euchariſtical Oblations, becauſe they denied the Sacrament to be the fleſh of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*, makes nothing for Tranſubſtantiation, as *Bellarmine* himſelf confeſſeth. *For* (ſaith he) *thoſe Hereticks did not oppoſe the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, ſo much as the myſtery of the Incarnation; and therefore* (*as* Ignatius *ſhews in that place*) *they would deny that the Euchariſt is the fleſh of Chriſt, that is,* (*as* Theodoret *interprets it*) *that the divine Myſteries of Bread and Wine ſhould be the ſigns of a real Body of Chriſt truly exiſting, becauſe they would not own that Chriſt had taken fleſh.* And ſo leſt they ſhould be forced to acknowledge the reality of the fleſh of Chriſt, they would wholly reject the Signs and Sacraments of it; for the ſigns of the body being given, the true body is given alſo, becauſe the ſubſtance and the type infer one another, and a Phantaſm or Illuſion is not capable of a ſign or repreſentation.

De Euch. l. 1. c. 1. 8. 3.

Dial. 2.

12. The words out of *Juſtin Martyr*, whereby they would prove Tranſubſtantiation, do ſtrongly diſprove it. *For* (ſaith he) *as by the word of God, our Saviour was incarnate, ſo by the Prayers of Gods word, the Euchariſt is made, whereby our bodies are nouriſhed, the Body and Blood of Chriſt.* Now when Chriſt took humane fleſh, none

Apol. 2. ad Ant imp.

could ſay without Hereſie that he was Tranſubſtantiated.

13. Neither is that againſt the Proteſtants which is brought out of St. *Cyprian*, (though it be none of his) *of the bread changed not in appearance, but in nature.* For he, whoever it was, took not the word *nature* in a ſtrict ſenſe, or elſe he was contrary to *Theodoret*, *Gelaſius*, and others above-mentioned, who expreſly deny that the bread ſhould be thus changed: But at large, as nature is taken for uſe, qualities, and condition. For by the infinite power of the Word the nature of the bread is ſo changed, that what was before a bare Element, becomes now a divine Sacrament, but without any Tranſubſtantiation; as appears by what follows in the ſame period, *of the Humane and Divine Natures of Chriſt*, where the Manhood is not ſubſtantially changed into the Godhead, except we will follow *Eutyches* the Heretick.

Serm. de Cœn. Dom.

14. The words of *Cyril*, as the Roman Doctors ſay, are ſo clear for them, that they admit of no evaſion: For (ſaith he) *he that changed once the water into Wine, is he not worthy to be believed that he changed the Wine into Bloud? Therefore let us with all certainty receive the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, for his*

Bell l. 2. de Euch. c. 12. Cyril. Hieroſ Catec. myſt. 4

his Body under the appearance of the Bread, and his Bloud under the appearance of the Wine are given to thee. Indeed Proteſtants do freely grant, and firmly believe, that the Wine (as hath often been ſaid) is changed into the Bloud of Chriſt, but every change is not a Tranſubſtantiation; neither doth *Cyril* ſay that this change is like that of the water, for then it would alſo appear to our ſenſes; but that he who changed the Water ſenſibly, can alſo change the Wine Sacramentally, will not be doubted by any. As for what he calls the Appearances of Bread and Wine, he doth not thereby exclude, but rather include their ſubſtance, and mean the Bread and Wine it ſelf: For ſo he intimates by what there follows; *Do not look on them as bare Bread and Wine*; as much as to ſay, it is bread indeed, but yet not bare bread, but ſomething beſides. But that this converſion of the Water into Wine makes nothing for Tranſubſtantiation, may be thus made to appear. That Gods Omnipotency can change one ſubſtance into another, none will deny, and we ſee it done by Chriſt in the Town of *Cana* of *Galilee*, when he changed the Water into Wine; and it was a true and proper Tranſubſtantiation. But the Papiſts in the

Senſu jam ſæpius dicto.

Lords Supper tell us of quite another change, which, if well conſidered, cannot ſo much as be underſtood. For the ſubſtance of the Bread is not changed into another that had no being, but, as they ſay, the bread is changed into that body of Chriſt which really exiſted and had a being theſe many hundred years, ever ſince the Incarnation: Whereas that very Wine which Chriſt made of the Water, was not in being before the change which he wrought. Now it is eaſie for any to underſtand, that he who created all things out of nothing, can well make a new Wine of Water, or any other thing; but it is more than abſurd, that the body of Chriſt, or any other ſubſtance already in being, perfect and complete, ſhould be made afreſh of another ſubſtance, when it really ſubſiſted before. Which they well underſtood who deviſed an adduction, or bringing of the Body of Chriſt into the place of the Bread, and that is as much as to deny Tranſubſtantiation; except it can be ſaid that a man is Tranſubſtantiated into another, as often as he comes into his place, which no man in his right wits can fancy.

Lib. 4. de San. c. 4. & de init. Myſt. c. 9.

15. St. *Ambroſe* ſaid alſo *that the nature is changed*, and indeed it is ſo; for other is the

the nature of the Element, and other that of the Sacrament; neither do Proteſtants deny *that the Element is changed by the bleſſing*, ſo that the bread being made ſacred, *is no more that which nature formed, but that which the Bleſſing conſecrated, and by conſecrating changed.* Mean while St. *Ambroſe* in that place doth not make the words or Bleſſing of Chriſt to have any other operation, than to make that which was, ſtill to be, and yet to be changed; therefore the bread is not made the body of Chriſt by Tranſubſtantiation, but by a Sacramental change. He adds, *That Sacrament which thou receiveſt is made by the word of Chriſt; and if the word of* Elias *had ſo much power as to bring down fire from heaven, ſhall not the words of Chriſt be efficacious enough to change the properties of the Elements? Thou haſt read of the Creation of all things, that he ſaid the word and it was done; and ſhall not that word of Chriſt, which made all out of nothing, change that which is already into that which it was not? Thou thy ſelf wert, but wert the old man, but being baptized, thou art now become a new Creature? Now it is as much to give a new nature, as to change the nature of a thing.* By theſe words he plainly declares his opinion that, by vertue of this change, the Elements of Bread and Wine

ceaſe not to be what they are by eſſence, and yet by the Conſecration are made what before they were not. But where did our Tranſubſtantiators learn out of St. *Ambroſe*, or any of the Fathers, that to make the Sacrament is the ſame as to bring the natural body of Chriſt, and put it under the accidents of the bread, or in the place of its ſubſtance which is vaniſht away? They ſay, *That the compariſon betwixt the things changed by Chriſt and the Prophet would be ſilly, if there be no more than a Sacramental change in the Euchariſt*; as though the Sacramental change were a thing of nought. *For* (ſaith Cardinal *Bellarmine*) *what power is there required to do nothing*? But Proteſtants anſwer, that the Greatneſs, Majeſty, Excellency, and Dignity of the Sacrament is ſuch, that they admire no leſs the Omnipotency of God in ſanctifying the Creatures to ſo high an office, and ſo holy an uſe, than in creating the world out of nothing, or changing the nature of things by the Miniſtry of his Prophets. For it is not by mans power, but by the divine vertue, that things earthly and mean of themſelves, are made to us aſſured Pledges of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt. And if they urge the Letter of thoſe words of St. *Am-*

Bell loco citato.

Lib. 2. de Euch. c. 9.

St. *Ambroſe*, *By the word of Chriſt the ſpecies of the Elements are changed*, as *Bellarmine* and others do, why then, they muſt confeſs, that not only the ſubſtance, but alſo the ſpecies, or accidents (as they call them) of the Bread and Wine, are changed into the Body and Bloud of Chriſt. And ſo, being St. *Ambroſe* and all the Ancients ſaid indifferently, as well that the ſpecies of the Bread and Wine, as that the Bread and Wine themſelves are changed, who will not from hence underſtand that the groundleſs Fabrick of Tranſubſtantiation (whereby they would have the ſubſtance of the Elements ſo aboliſhed in the Sacrament, that their meer accidents or appearances remain without any ſubject) is ſtrongly battered and utterly ruined?

16. All other Teſtimonies of the Fathers, if they ſay *that the Bread is made the Body of Chriſt*, are willingly owned by Proteſtants. For they hold that the Element cannot become a Sacrament, nor the Sacrament have a being without the thing which it repreſents. For the Cardinal himſelf will not affirm that the Body of Chriſt is produced out of the Bread. This is therefore what we ſay with St. *Auſtin*, and endeavour to prove by all means; That

The reſt of the Fathers.

De Conſecr. diſt. 2. c. hoc eſt.

That the Sacrifice of the Euchariſt is made of two things, the viſible Element, and the inviſible Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, as the Perſon of Chriſt conſiſteth of the Godhead and Manhood, he being true God and true Man; for every compound retains the nature of that whereof it is made: Now the Sacrament is compoſed of two things, the Sign, and the thing ſignified, that is the Body of Chriſt.

17. Let the Champions of Tranſubſtantiation ſtrut and vapour now, with their two and thirty ſtout Seconds, [a] who have ſtood for them, as they ſay, before the time of Pope *Innocent* the Third! For what [b] *Innocent* the Third decreed, and the Council of *Trent* [c] defined, (*that it was ever the perſwaſion of the Catholick Church, that the Bread is ſo changed into the Body of Chriſt, that the ſubſtance of the bread vaniſhing away, only the fleſh of Chriſt ſhould remain under the accidents of the bread,*) is ſo far from being true, that the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, not only as to the name, but as to the thing it ſelf, is wholly deſtitute of the Patronage of Antiquity, and left to ſhift for it ſelf. [d] *Alphonſus à Caſtro* ſaid, that in ancient Writers mention was made very ſeldom of Tranſubſtantiation; had he ſaid never, it had been more true. For ſo our *Jeſuites* [e] in *England* confeſſed, *That the*

a *Card. Bellar. de Euch. l. 3. c. 20. 3. v.*

b *Extrà de Trin. & fide Cathol. c. 1*

c *Seſſ. 13. ca. 4.*

d *Lib. 8. contr. Hæreſes Indulg.*

e *Diſcurſ. modeſt. de Jeſuit. p. 13. & Waſ. Quodl. l. 2. art. 4.*

the buſineſs of Tranſubſtantiation was not ſo much as toucht by the ancient Fathers; which is very true, as will appear more at large in the following Chapter.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Writers of the Eleventh and Twelfth Century, from whom we may eaſily deduce and trace the Hiſtory of Papal Tranſubſtantiation. 1. *What manner of Popes they were in thoſe times.* 2. *The unhappy Age, wherein Divines were divided about the Point of the Euchariſt.* 3. *The opinion of* Fulbertus. 4. *Followed by his Diſciple* Berengarius, *who is oppoſed by others.* 5, 6. *The Doctrine of* Berengarius *defended.* 7. *The roaring of* Leo *the Ninth againſt* Berengarius. 8. *The Synod of* Tours *under* Victor *the Second, which cleared* Berengarius *as free from Error.* 9. *Pope* Nicolas *the Second, gathers another Synod againſt* Berengarius, *who is forced to make a wondrous*

drous kind of Recantation. 10. The Authors of the ordinary Gloſs cenſure the Recantation impoſed on Berengarius. 11. He ſaith that he was violently compelled to make it for fear of being put to death. Lanfrancus and Guitmundus write againſt him. 12. Of Pope Hildebrand, and his Roman Council, wherein Berengarius was again cited and condemned in vain. 13. The Doctrine of St. Bernard approved. 14. The Opinion of Rupertus. 15. Lombard could define nothing of the Tranſubſtantiation of the Bread, and reaſons poorly upon the independency of the accidents. 16. Otho Friſingenſis and thoſe of his time confeſt that the Bread and Wine remain in the Euchariſt. 17. P. Bleſenſis and St. Eduenſis were the firſt that uſed the word of Tranſubſtantiation. 18. Of the thirteenth Century, wherein Pope Innocent the Third publiſhed his Decree of the Tranſubſtantiation of the Bread and Wine

Wine into the Body and Bloud of Christ. 19, *and* 20. *The wonderful pride of* Innocent *the Third. The* Lateran *Council determined nothing concerning that Point.* 21. *The cruelty of the same* Innocent, *who by the Rack and the Fire sought to establish his new Doctrine.* 22. *What* Gerson *said of the* Roman *Church in his time. Many more Inventions proceed from Transubstantiation. Inextricable and unheard of questions.* 23. *New Orders of Monks and of the School-men.* 24. *Of their fine wrangling and disputing.* 25. *The Sacrament abused most grosly by the Patrons of Transubstantiation.* 26, *and* 27. Holkot, Aquinas, Albertus Magnus, *and other Schoolmen, though sometimes they be not for Transubstantiation, yet they wholly submit to the Judgment of the Pope.* 28. *Of the Council of* Constance. *which took the Cup from the Laity.* 29. *Cardinal* Cameracensis *denies that Transubstantiation*

ſtantiation can be proved by holy Scripture. 30. *Of the Council of* Florence, *and the Inſtruction of the* Armenians *by Pope* Eugenius *the Fourth.* 31. *The Papal Curſe in the Council of* Trent, *not to be feared. The Concluſion of the Book.*

1. WE have proved it before, that the Leproſie of Tranſubſtantiation did not begin to ſpread over the body of the Church in a thouſand years after Chriſt. But at laſt the thouſand years being expired, and Satan looſed out of his Priſon, to go and deceive the Nations, and compaſs the Camp of the Saints about, then to the great damage of Chriſtian Peace and Religion, they began here and there to diſpute againſt the clear, conſtant, and univerſal conſent of the Fathers, and to maintain the new-ſtarted opinion. It is known to them that underſtand Hiſtory, what manner of times were then, and what were thoſe Biſhops who then governed the Church of *Rome*, *Sylveſter* II, *John* XIX, and XX, *Sergius* IV, *Benedictus* VIII, *John* XXI, *Benedict* IX, *Sylveſter* III, *Gregory* VI, *Damaſus*

maſus II, *Leo* IX, *Nicolas* II, *Gregory* VII, or *Hildebrand*; who tore to pieces the Church of *Rome* with grievous Schiſms, cruel Wars, and great Slaughters. For the *Roman* Pontificat was come to that paſs, that good men being put by, they whoſe Life and Doctrine was pious being oppreſſed, none could obtain that dignity, but they that could bribe beſt, and were moſt ambitious.

Card. Bar. Tom. 10. Annal. an. 897. § 4. Gilb. Genebr. Chron. ſub init. ſeculi 10.

2. In that unhappy Age the Learned were at odds about the preſence of the Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament; ſome defending the ancient Doctrine of the Church, and ſome the new-ſprung up opinion.

3. *Fulbert*, Biſhop of *Chartres*, was Tutor to *Berengarius*, whom we ſhall ſoon have occaſion to ſpeak of, and his Doctrine was altogether conformable to that of the Primitive Church, as appears clearly out of his Epiſtle to *Adeodatus*, wherein he teacheth, *That the Myſtery of Faith in the Euchariſt, is not to be lookt on with our bodily eyes, but with the eyes of our mind. For what appears outwardly Bread and Wine, is made inwardly the Body and Bloud of Chriſt; not that which is taſted with the mouth, but that which is reliſh'd by the hearts affection. Therefore* (ſaith he) *prepare the palate of thy Faith,*

Fulbert Biſhop of Chartres. An. 1010.

Ep. ad Adeod. inter alia ejus opera impreſſa Pariſ. An. 1608.

Faith, open the throat of thy Hope, and inlarge the bowels of thy Charity, and take that Bread of life which is the food of the inward man. Again. *The perception of a divine taſte proceeds from the faith of the inward man, whilſt by receiving the ſaving Sacrament, Chriſt is received into the ſoul.* All this is againſt thoſe who teach in too groſs a manner, that Chriſt in this Myſtery enters carnally the mouth and ſtomach of the Receivers.

Bereng. Archdeacon of Angers. An. 1030.

4. *Fulbert* was followed by *Berengarius* his Scholar, Archdeacon of *Angers* in *France*, a man of great worth, by the holineſs both of his life and doctrine, as *Platina*, *Vincentius Bergomenſis*, and many more. Witneſs this Encomium writ ſoon after his death by *Hildebert* Biſhop of *Mans*, a moſt learned man, is thus recorded by our *William* of *Malmsbury*.

Guliel. Malmſ. de geſtis Regum Anglorum lib. 3.

That Berengarius *who was ſo admired,*
Although his name yet lives, is now expired;
H' out-lives himſelf, yet a ſad fatal day
Him from the Church and State did ſnatch away.
O dreadful day, why didſt thou play the Thief?
And fill the world with ruine and with grief?
For by his death, the Church, the Laws, and all
The Clergies glory do receive a fall:

His

His ſacred wiſdom was too great for fame,
And the whole World's too little for his name;
Which to its proper Zenith none can raiſe,
His merits do ſo far exceed all praiſe.
Then ſurely thou art bleſt, nor doſt thou leſs
Heaven with thy Soul, Earth with thy Body bleſs.
When I go hence, O may I dwell with thee,
In thine appointed place where e're it be.

Now this *Berengarius* was not only Archdeacon of *Angers*, but alſo the *Scholaſticus*, or Maſter of the Chair, of the ſame Church (*which dignity is ever enjoyed by the Chancellor of the Univerſity, for his Office is in great Churches to teach the Clergy, and inſtruct them in ſound doctrine.*) All this I have produced more at large to manifeſt the baſe and injurious Calumnies, caſt upon this worthy and famous man by latter Writers, as [a] *John Garetius* of *Lovain*, [b] *William Alan* our Country-man, and others; who not only accuſe him of being an Heretick, but alſo a worthleſs and an unlearned man.

A. Thevet. Vit. illuſt. Vir. l. 3. c. 62.

Pap. Maſſ. Annal. Franc. l. 3.

[a] *Garet. de verâ præſent. in Epiſt. nuncup. & Claſ. 5. A. 1040.*

[b] *Alan. de Euch. l. 1. c. 21.*

5. *Berengarius* ſtood up valiantly in defence of that Doctrine which 170 years before, was delivered out of Gods Word and the holy Fathers, in *France* by *Bertram*, and *John Erigena*, and by others elſe-

where, againſt thoſe who taught that in the Euchariſt neither Bread nor Wine remained after the Conſecration. Yet he did not either believe or teach (as many falſly and ſhameleſly have imputed to him) that nothing more is received in the Lords Supper, but bare Signs only, or meer Bread and Wine; but he believed and openly profeſt, as St. *Auſtin* and other faithful Doctors of the Church had taught out of Gods Word, that in this Myſtery, the ſouls of the Faithful are truly fed by the true Body and Bloud of Chriſt to life eternal. Nevertheleſs it was neither his mind nor his doctrine, that the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine is reduced to nothing, or changed into the ſubſtance of the natural Body of Chriſt, or (as ſome then would have had the Church believe) that Chriſt himſelf comes down carnally from heaven. Intire books he wrote upon this ſubject, but they have been wholly ſuppreſt by his Enemies, and now are not to be found. Yet what we have of him in his greateſt Enemy *Lanfrank* I here ſet down; *By the Conſecration at the Altar the Bread and Wine are made a Sacrament of Religion; not to ceaſe to be what they were, but to be changed into ſomething elſe, and to become what they were not;*

Extant apud Lan. fr. deverit. corp. Dom. in Euch.

not; agreeable to what St. *Ambroſe* had taught. Again, *There are two parts in the Sacrifice of the Church* (this is according to St. *Irenæus*) *the viſible Sacrament, and the inviſible thing of the Sacrament, that is, the Body of Chriſt.* Item, *The Bread and Wine which are Conſecrated, remain in their ſubſtance, having a reſemblance with that whereof they are a Sacrament, for elſe they could not be a Sacrament.* Laſtly, *Sacraments are viſible Signs of divine things, but in them the inviſible things are honoured.* All this agrees well with St. *Auſtin* and other Fathers above cited.

6. He did not therefore by this his Doctrine exclude the Body of Chriſt from the Sacrament, but in its right adminiſtration he joyned together the thing ſignified with the ſacred Sign; and taught that the Body of Chriſt was not eaten with the mouth in a carnal way, but with the Mind, and Soul, and Spirit. Neither did *Berengarius* alone maintain this Orthodox and ancient Doctrine; for [a] *Sigibert*, [b] *William* of *Malmesbury*, [c] *Matthew Paris*, and [d] *Matthew* of *Weſtminſter* make it certain, *that almoſt all the* French, Italians, *and* Engliſh *of thoſe times were of the ſame opinion; and that many things*

a *Chron. è Miræo editum.*
b *In Contin Bedæ.*
c *In hiſt. majori ad An.* 1037.
d *Ad eundum annum.*

Baron. ad An. 1035. § 1. 6.

were ſaid, writ, and diſputed in its defence by many men; amongſt whom was *Bruno*, then Biſhop of the ſame Church of *Angers*. Now this greatly diſpleaſeth the Papal faction, who took great care that thoſe mens Writings ſhould not be delivered to Poſterity, and now do write, that the Doctrine of *Berengarius*, owned by the Fathers, and maintained by many famous Nations, ſculkt only in ſome dark corner or other.

7. The firſt Pope who oppoſed himſelf to *Berengarius* was *Leo* the [e] Ninth, a plain man indeed, but too much led by *Humbert* and *Hildebrand*. For as ſoon as he was deſired, [f] he pronounced ſentence of Excommunication againſt *Berengarius* abſent and unheard; and not long after he called a Council at *Verceil*, wherein *John Erigena* and *Berengarius* [g] were condemned, upon this account, that they ſhould ſay, that the Bread and Wine in the [h] Euchariſt are only bare Signs; which was far from their thoughts, and farther yet from their belief. This roaring therefore of the *Lion* frighted not *Berengarius*, nay, the [i] *Gallican* Churches did alſo oppoſe the Pope, and his Synod of *Verceil*, and defend with *Berengarius* the oppreſſed truth.

e *A* 1050. *Conc. Ver. ſub Leone Papa* 9.

f *Lanfr. in libro citato.*

g But it was about 200 years after the death of this moſt innocent man.

h *Adelm. in Ep. ad Bereng.*

i Theſe of *Ren. Ang. Leon, Dola & Maclo. &c.*

8. To

8. To *Leo* ſucceeded Pope *Victor* the Second, who ſeeing that *Berengarius* could not be caſt down and cruſht by the Fulminations of his Predeceſſor, ſent his Legate *Hildebrand* into *France*, and called another Council at *Tours*, where *Berengarius*, being cited, did freely appear, and whence he was freely diſmiſt, after he had given it under his hand, that the Bread and Wine in the Sacrifice of the Church, are not ſhadows and empty figures; and that he held none other but the common Doctrine of the Church concerning the Sacrament. For he did not alter his judgment (as modern Papiſts give out) but he perſiſted to teach and maintain the ſame Doctrine as before, as *Lanfrank* complains of him. *An.* 1055. *Conc. Turon. ſub Vict. Papa* II.

9. Yet his Enemies would not reſt ſatisfied with this, but they urged Pope *Nicholas* the Second, who (within a few months that *Stephen* the Tenth ſate) ſucceeded *Victor* without the Emperours conſent, to call a new Council at *Rome* againſt *Berengarius*. For, that ſenſual manner of preſence, by them deviſed, to the great diſhonour of Chriſt, being rejected by *Berengarius*, and he teaching as he did before That the Body of Chriſt was not preſent in ſuch a ſort, as that it might *An.* 1058. *Con. Rom. ſub Nicol. Papa* II.

might be at pleaſure brought in and out, taken into the ſtomach, caſt on the ground, trod under foot, and bit or devoured by any beaſts, they falſly charged him as if he had denied that it is preſent at all. An hundred and thirteen Biſhops came to the Council, to obey the Popes Mandate, *Berengarius* came alſo; *And* (as [k] *Sigonius* and [l] *Leo Oſtienſis* ſay) *when none preſent could withſtand him, they ſent for one* Alberic us, *a Monk of* Mont Caſſin, *made Cardinal by Pope* Stephen, who having asked ſeven days time, to anſwer in writing, brought at laſt his Scroll againſt *Berengarius*. The Reaſons and Arguments uſed therein to convince his Antagoniſt are not now extant, but whatever they were, *Berengarius* was commanded preſently without any delay [m] to recant, in that form preſcribed and appointed by Cardinal *Humbert*, which was thus: [n] *I* Berengarius, *&c. aſſent to the holy Roman, and Apoſtolick See, and with my heart and mouth do profeſs that I hold that Faith concerning the Sacrament of the Lords Table which our Lord and Venerable Pope* Nicholas, *and this ſacred Council, have determined and impoſed upon me by their Evangelick and Apoſtolick Authority; to wit, That the Bread and Wine which are ſet on the Altar, are not after the Conſecration only*

An. 1059.

k *De Regn. Ital. l.* 9. *An.* 1059.

l *In Chro. Caſſin. l.* 3. *c.* 33.

m *Baron. ad A.* 1059 § 18.

n *Habetur apud Gratian. de Conſecr. diſt.* 2. *cap.* 42.

only a Saerament, Sign, and figure, but alſo the very Body and Bloud of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, (thus far it is well enough, but what follows is too horrid, and is diſowned by the Papiſts themſelves) *and that they* (the Body and Bloud) *are touched and broken with the hands of the Prieſts, and ground with the teeth of the Faithful, not Sacramentally only, but in truth and ſenſibly.* This is the Preſcript of the Recantation impoſed on *Berengarius*, and by him at firſt rejected, but by impriſonment, and threats, and fear of being put to death, at laſt extorted from [o] him.

[o] *Pap. Maſſ. Annal. Franc. l. 3.*

10. This form of Recantation is to be found entire in [a] *Lanfrank*, [b] *Algerus*, and [c] *Gracian*; yet the Gloſſer on *Gratian*, [d] *John Semeca* marks it with this note; *Except you underſtand well the words of* Berengarius (he ſhould rather have ſaid of Pope *Nicholas*, and Cardinal *Humbertus*) *you ſhall fall into a greater Hereſie than his was,* [e] *for he exceeded the truth, and ſpake hyperbolically.* And ſo [f] *Richard de Mediavilla*; Berengarius *being accuſed, overſhot himſelf in his Juſtification*; but the exceſs of his words ſhould be aſcribed to thoſe who preſcribed and forced them upon him. Yet in all this we hear nothing of Tranſubſtantiation.

[a] *Sub libri quem cont. Bereng. ſcripſit initium.*
[b] *Lib 2. c. 15.*
[c] *Ubi ſupra*
[d] *In C. ego Bereng. de Conſecrat. diſt. 2.*
[e] *In C. utrum ſub figura 72.*
[f] *In 4 diſt. 9. prin. 1. q. 1.*

11. *Berengarius* at last escaped out of this danger, and conscious to himself of having denied the truth, took heart again, and refuted in writing his own impious and absurd Recantation, and said, *That by force it was exterted from him by the Church of Malignants, the Council of vanity. Lanfrank* of *Caen*, at that time head of a Monastery in *France*, afterwards Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and *Guitmundus*, *Aversanus* answered him. And though it is not to be doubted but that *Berengarius*, and those of his Party, writ and replied again and again, yet so well did their Adversaries look to it, that nothing of theirs remains, save some Citations in *Lanfrank*. But it were to be wisht that we had now the entire Works of *Berengarius*, who was a learned man, and a constant follower of Antiquity, for out of them we might know with more certainty how things went, then we can out of what his profest enemies have said.

Concil. Rom sub Hild. Papa A. 1079.

12. This Sacramental debate ceased a while because of the tumults of War raised in *Apulia* and elsewhere by Pope *Nicholas* the Second; but it began again as soon as *Hildebrand*, called *Gregory* the Seventh, came to the Papal Chair. For

Berengarius

Berengarius was cited again to a new Council at *Rome*, *where ſome being of one opinion, and ſome of another*, (as it is in the [g] Acts of that Council, writ by thoſe of the Popes Faction) his cauſe could not be ſo intirely oppreſſed but that ſome Biſhops were ſtill found to uphold it. Nay, the Ring-leader himſelf, *Hildebrand*, is ſaid to have doubted, [h] *whether what we receive at the Lords Table be indeed the Body of Chriſt by a ſubſtantial converſion.* But [i] three months ſpace having been granted to *Berengarius*, and a Faſt appointed to the Cardinals, [k] *that God would ſhew by ſome ſign from heaven* (which yet he did not) *who was in the right the Pope or* Berengarius *concerning the Body of the Lord*; at laſt the buſineſs was decided without any Oracle from above, and a new form of retractation impoſed on [l] *Berengarius* whereby he was henceforth forward to confeſs, under pain of the Popes high diſpleaſure, *that the Myſtick Bread* (firſt made [m] Magical and enchanting by *Hildebrand*) *is ſubſtantially turned into* [n] *the true and proper Fleſh of Chriſt*, which whether he ever did is not certain. For though [o] *Malmesbury* tells us,

g *Excuſ. cum Lanfran. libro, & apud Binium.*

h *Engilb. Archiep. Trevir. apud Goldaſt. Imp. Tom. 1.*

i *Bertold. Conſt. Chron. An.* 1079.

k *Benno Card. in vita Hild.*

l *Habetur iſta formula apud Tho. Waldenſ. Tom. 2. c. 42. & in Regeſt. Greg. 7.*

m *Brix. Syn. Epiſc. apud Abb. Uſperg. in Chron. ad An.* 1080.

n *Addit formula præſcripta in proprietate naturæ.*

o *De Geſt. Angl. l. 3. c. 58. Et poſt eum ab aliis. Vide Bell. Chronol. An.* 1079.

that

that he died in that Roman Faith, yet [p] there are ancienter than he, who [q] ſay, *that he was never converted from his firſt opinion*. And ſome relate, *that after this laſt condemnation having given over his Studies, and given to the poor all he had, he wrought with his own hands for his* [r] *living*. Other things related of him by ſome ſlaves of the *Roman* See, deſerve no credit. Theſe things happened, as we have ſaid, in the year 1079. and ſoon after *Berengarius* died.

p *Pegm. Comment.* 31. *ad* 2. *part. direct. inquiſit.*

q *Bertol. Conſt. qui tempore Brengar. vixit ad An.* 1083.

r *Vincent. in Spec. l.* 26. *c.* 40. *Baron. ad An.* 1088. §. 15, *&c.*

13. *Berengarius* being dead the Orthodox and ancient Doctrine of the Lords Supper which he maintained did not die with him (as the [s] *Chronicus Caſſinenſis* would have it:) For it was ſtill conſtantly retained by St. *Bernard*, Abbot of *Clairvaux*, who lived about the beginning of the twelfth Century. In his diſcourſe on the Lords Supper, he joyns together *the outward form of the Sacrament*, and *the ſpiritual efficacy of it*, as the ſhell and the kernel, the ſacred Sign, and the thing ſignified; the one he takes out of the words of the Inſtitution, and the other, out of Chriſts Sermon in the ſixth of St. *John*. And in the ſame place explaining, that Sacraments are not *things abſolute* in themſelves

s *Chron. Caſſin. l.* 3. *c.* 33. *St. Bern. An.* 1120.

Serm. de Cœna Dom. Joh. 6, 56, 63.

ſelves without any relation, but Myſteries, wherein by the gift of a viſible ſign, an inviſible and divine grace with the Body and Bloud of Chriſt is given, he ſaith; *That the viſible Sign is as a Ring, which is given not for it ſelf or abſolutely, but to inveſt and give poſſeſſion of an Eſtate made over to one. Many things* (ſaith he) *are done for their own ſake, and many in reference to ſomething elſe, and then they are called Signs. A Ring is given abſolutely as a gift, and then it hath no other meaning; it is alſo given to make good an Inveſtiture or Contract, and then it is a Sign: So that he that receives it may ſay, The Ring is not worth much, it is what it ſignifies, the Inheritance I value. In this manner when the Paſſion of our Lord drew nigh, he took care that his Diſciples might be inveſted with his grace, that his inviſible grace might be aſſured and given to them by a viſible ſign. To this end all Sacraments are inſtituted, and to this the participation of the Euchariſt is appointed.* Now, as no man can fancy that the Ring is ſubſtantially changed into the Inheritance, whether Lands or Houſes, none alſo can ſay with truth, or without abſurdity, that the Bread and Wine are ſubſtantially changed into the Body and Bloud of Chriſt. But in his Sermon on the Purification, which none doubts to be his, he ſpeaks

Serm. de Purif. B. Mariæ.

ſpeaks yet more plain; *The Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament is the food of the ſoul, not of the belly, therefore we eat him not corporally; but in the manner that Chriſt is meat, in the ſame manner we underſtand that he is eaten.* Alſo in his Sermon on St. *Martin*, which undoubtedly is his alſo; *To this day* (ſaith he) *the ſame fleſh is given to us, but ſpiritually, therefore not corporally.* For the truth of things ſpiritually preſent is certain alſo. As to what he ſaith in another place, *that the Prieſt holds God in his hands*, it is a flouriſh of Oratory, as is that of St. *Chryſoſtom, In comes the Prieſt carrying the Holy Ghoſt.*

Serm. de S. Mart.

Lib. 3. de Sacerd.

Rupert. Abb. An. 1125.

14. About the ſame time *Rupertus*, Abbot of *Tuitium*, famous by his Writings, did alſo teach that the Subſtance of the Bread in the Euchariſt is not converted, but remains. Theſe be his words; [a] *You muſt attribute all to the operation of the Holy Ghoſt, who never ſpoils or deſtroys any ſubſtance he uſeth, but to that natural Goodneſs it had before, adds an inviſible excellency which it had not.* He hath [b] indeed an unwarrantable opinion of the Union of the Bread and Body of Chriſt into one Perſon, but it came (as ſome others, as abſurd in that Age) from too great a curioſity about determining the manner of Chriſts

a *In Exod. l. 2. c. 10.*

b *Ex quâ Conſequabatur, Panem eſſe Corpus Chriſti, ſed Corpus non humanum neque carneum, ſed Panaceum.*

Chriſts Preſence, and of the Union of his Body with the Bread, about which that learned man troubled himſelf too much. However he neither taught nor mentioned Tranſubſtantiation.

15. Not long after that *Algerus*, a Monk, and ſome others had had ſome diſputes about this ſubject, *Pet. Lombard* made up his Books of Sentences, in the fourth whereof he treats of the Euchariſt, and thinks that it is taught by ſome ſayings of the Ancients; *That the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine is changed into the Body and Bloud of Chriſt.* But ſoon after he adds; *If it be demanded what manner of change that is, whether formal, or ſubſtantial, or of any other kind, that I cannot reſolve.* Therefore he did not yet hold Tranſubſtantiation as a point of Faith: Nay, he doth not ſeem conſtant to himſelf in making it a probable opinion, but rather to waver, to ſay and unſay, and to ſhelter his cauſe under the Fathers name, rather than maintain it himſelf. Of the accidents remaining without a ſubject, and of the breaking into parts the body of Chriſt, (as *Berengarius* was bid to ſay by Pope *Nicholas*) he reaſons ſtrangely but very poorly.

Pet. Lombard An. 1140. Sent. l. 4. Diſt. 10. Diſt. 11.

16. *Otho*, Biſhop of *Friſingen*, as great by his Piety and Learning as by his Bloud, (for

Otho Friſingenſis, An. 1145.

(for he was Nephew to *Henry* the Fourth, and the Emperour *Henry* the Fifth married his Sister, he was also Uncle to *Frederick*, and half Brother to King *Conrade*) lived about the same time. He believed and writ, [c] *That the Bread and Wine remain in the Eucharist*, as did many more in that Age.

[c] *Christ. Agric. in Antipist. p.* 13.

An. 1180. 17. As for the new-coyn'd word *Transubstantiation* it is hardly to be found before the middle of this Century. For the first that mention it are [d] *Petrus Blesensis*, who lived under Pope *Alexander* the Third, and *Stephen Eduensis* [e] a Bishop, whose Age and Writings are very doubtful. And those latter Authors [f] who make it as ancient as the tenth Century, want sufficient Witnesses to prove it by, as I said [g] before.

[d] *Ep.* 140.
[e] *De Sacr. Altaris in B. B. Patrum.*
[f] *Bell. & Possev de Script. Eccl.*
[g] *Chap.* 5. *Art.* 50.

An. 1215. *Innocen.* 3. *Papa.* 18. The thirteenth Century now follows; wherein the World growing both older and worse, a great deal of trouble and confusion there was about Religion; the Bishop of *Rome* exalted himself not only into his lofty Chair, over the Universal Church, but even into a Majestical Throne, over all the Empires and Kingdoms of the world. New Orders of Friers sprung up in this Age, who disputed and clamoured fiercely against many Doctrines

Doctrines of the ancienter and purer Church, and amongſt the reſt againſt that of the Sacrament of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt: So that now there remained nothing but to confirm the new Tenet of Tranſubſtantiation, and impoſe it ſo peremptorily on the Chriſtian world, that none might dare ſo much as to hiſs againſt it. This Pope *Innocent* the Third bravely performed. He ſucceeding *Celeſtin* the Third at thirty years of age, and marching ſtoutly in the foot-ſteps of *Hildebrand*, called a Council at *Rome* in St. *John Lateran*, and was the firſt that ever preſumed to make the new-deviſed-Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation an Article of Faith neceſſary to ſalvation, and that by his own meer authority. *The Lateran Council.*

19. How much he took upon himſelf, and what was the mans ſpirit and humour will eaſily appear to any man by theſe his words which I here ſet down. *To me it is ſaid in the Prophet, I have ſet thee over Nations, and over Kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to deſtroy, and to throw down, and to build, and to plant. To me alſo it is ſaid in the perſon of the Apoſtle, To thee will I give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. For I am in a middle ſtate betwixt God and man, below God, but above man; yea, greater than man, being* *Innocen 3. Serm. 2.*

being I judge all men, and can be judged by none.

h *Idem Serm.* 3.

i *Joh.* 3. 29

h *Am not I the Bridegroom, and each of you* i *the Bridegrooms friend? The Bridegroom I am, because I have the Bride, the noble, rich, lofty, and holy Church of* Rome, *who is the Mother and Miſtris of all the Faithful, who hath brought me a precious and ineſtimable*

k *Addit, multæ filiæ congregaverunt divitias, hæc autem ſola ſupergreſſa eſt universas.*

l *Epiſt. ad Imper. Conſtant. Extrà de Majorit. & Obedientia. c.* 6.

k *portion, to wit, the fulneſs of things ſpiritual, and the vaſtneſs of temporal, with the greatneſs and multitude of both*—— l *God made two great Lights in the Firmament of heaven; he hath alſo made two great Lights in the firmament of the Univerſal Church, that is, he hath inſtituted two dignities which are the Papal authority, and the Regal. But that which governs the day, that is, ſpiritual things, is the greater; and that which governs carnal things the leſs; ſo that it ought to be acknowledged that there is the ſame difference between the* (Roman) *High Prieſt and Kings, as between the Sun and Moon.* Thus he, when he was become Chriſts Vicar, or rather his Rival. Theſe things I rehearſe that we may ſee how things went, and what was the face of the *Latine* Church, when Pope *Innocent* the Third propounded and impoſed Tranſubſtantiation as an Article of Faith; m as is plainly and at large ſet down by a learned

m *Exerc. de Tranſubſt.*

Author

Author *George Calixtus* who deſerves equally to be praiſed and imitated.

20. This *Innocent* therefore, who to encreaſe his Power and Authority wrought great troubles to the Emperour *Philip*, ſtript *Otho* the Fourth of the Empire, forced *John* King of *England* to yield up into his hand this Kingdom, and that of *Ireland*, and make them Tributary to the See of *Rome*; who, under pretence of a ſpiritual Juriſdiction, took to himſelf both the Supreme Power over things temporal, and the things themſelves; who *was proud and ambicious beyond all men, covetous to the height of greedineſs* (they are the words of [n] *Matthew Paris, and ever ready to commit the moſt wicked villanies ſo he might be recompenced for it*; this (I ſay) was the man who in his *Lateran* Council propounded that Tranſubſtantiation ſhould be made an Article of Faith, and when the Council would not [o] grant it, did it himſelf by his own Arbitrary Power, againſt which none durſt open his mouth. For thoſe Canons which this day are ſhewn about under the name of the Council, are none of his, but meerly the Decrees of Pope *Innocent*, firſt writ by him, and read in the [p] Council, and diſliked by many, and afterwards ſet down in the

n *In hiſt. Johan. Regis Angliæ.*

o *Mat. Paris in hiſt. minori. & Platin. in vita Innocent. 3.*

p *Verba Mat. Par. in Hiſt. Mai. ad An. 1215.*

Book of Decretals under certain titles, by his Nephew *Gregory* the Ninth.

Extr. de fide & ſum. Trin. c firmiter credimus.

21. The ſame Pope, after he had pronounced them Hereticks who for the future ſhould deny *that the Body and Bloud of Chriſt are truly contained in the Sacrament of the Altar, under the outward form of Bread and Wine, the Bread being Tranſubſtantiated into the Body, and the Wine into the Bloud; delivers them all, of what office or dignity ſoever, to the Secular Power* [q] *to receive condign puniſhment*, that is, to be burnt, commands thoſe that are ſuſpected to be tried and examined; and declares them infamous, diſabled from making a Will, and incapable of any Office or Inheritance that ſhould favour or entertain them, and ſets all other Chriſtians againſt them. Then he ordains [r] *that the Secular Powers ſhall be compelled by Eccleſiaſtick Cenſures publickly to ſwear that they will defend* (This) *Faith, and endeavour utterly to deſtroy all whom the Church* (of Rome) *ſhould note for Hereticks. But* (ſaith he) *if the temporal Prince doth neglect this, let him be excommunicated: And if he ſlights to give ſatisfaction within a year, let the ſoveraign Pontif be certified of it, that he may abſolve his Subjects from their allegiance, and expoſe his Territories to be taken and enjoyed without any contradiction by any Catholicks*

q *Ibid.*

r *Ibid.*

Catholicks (Romans) *that deſtroy the Hereticks*, &c. (that is, thoſe who do not believe Tranſubſtantiation.) Thus *Innocent* the Third by Excommunications, and by Arms, by Rebellions, by Tortures, and by burning alive was pleaſed to eſtabliſh his new Article of Faith.

22. And truly had he not uſed ſuch means, they themſelves who did cleave to the Church of *Rome* would not have embraced this Doctrine. For it did not find ſuch acceptance, but that many notwithſtanding did now and then oppoſe it. Nay, not only Tranſubſtantiation, but even the Church (or rather the Court) of *Rome*, which, if we believe Chancellour [f] *Gerſon, was at this time wholly brutiſh and carnal, without almoſt any ſenſe of the things of God*, was rejected by many, as it is well known. For certain it is, that Tranſubſtantiation being once eſtabliſhed, there was a foundation laid to many Superſtitions and Errors, which could neither be ſuffered nor approved by thoſe that feared God. And among the Subſcribers to Tranſubſtantiation there grew a thicket of thorny and monſtrous queſtions, wherewith the Schoolmen were ſo buſie, that it may with great truth be affirmed, that then came to light a Divinity concerning

Tranſubſtantiation and the Court of *Rome* rejected by many.

[f] *Gerſ. de Conſil. gener.*

the holy Sacrament, and the Adoration of it, which was not only very new, but very ſtrange alſo, and never heard of among the Fathers. There grew alſo out of the ſame ſtock Illuſions, and falſe Miracles, deceitful Dreams, feined Viſions, and ſuch like unchriſtian devices about the Corporal Preſence of Chriſt, as that ſome did ſee a Child in the Hoſt, ſome Fleſh, ſome Bloud, any thing that could come into the idle fancies of idle and ſuperſtitious men. [t] *One at the point of death durſt not receive the Body of Chriſt, becauſe he could keep nothing in; but as he drew nigh to adore it, his Breaſt bare, and his Arms open, the Hoſt, leaping out of the Prieſts hand, having made it ſelf a paſſage, entred of its own accord into the place where the dying mans heart lay hid, and the hole being made up again without any thing of a ſcar, the man lay down and then expired.* [u] *Another being ready to die begged, that, his ſide being waſht, and covered with a clean cloath, the Body of Chriſt might be ſet on it: Which being done, the cloath by degrees gave place to the Body of Chriſt, and ſoon after when that divine Body toucht the mans skin, it penetrated to his very heart in the ſight of all the by ſtanders.* They alſo tell the Story, or rather the Fable, *How that the Body of Chriſt* (for ſo they call the Conſecrated

t *Thom. Walſing. in hypod. neuſtr. ad An.* 1218.

u *Diſcip. de Temp. Serm.* 80.

ſecrated Bread) *being ſet in a Buſhel upon ſome Oats, an Horſe, an Oxe, and an Aſs bowed their knees, and adored their Lord in the Hoſt.* Theſe, and ſuch like Fictions were dayly invented without number by the Patrons of Tranſubſtantiation, and the impudence and boldneſs of coyning ſuch Forgeries hath from them paſt upon their Succeſſors. This was obſerved by King *James* in the Writings of [x] *Bellarmine* himſelf, who reports *of a certain devout Mare* that worſhipped the Hoſt kneeling, (knowing doubtleſs that by a due Conſecration it was Tranſubſtantiated.) *Ceſarius* the Monk, who lived ſoon after *Innocent* the Third, is full of ſuch Miracles; and yet he hath a Hiſtory which ſhews that in his time Tranſubſtantiation was utterly unknown to a learned Prieſt, Canon of a great Church. *At* Colen (ſaith he) *there was a Canon in full Orders, called* Peter, *when on a certain day another of the Canons was ſick, and about to receive the Sacrament in his preſence, the officiating Prieſt asked the ſick man, Doſt thou believe that this is the true Body of the Lord which was born of the Virgin? He made anſwer, I believe it*; Peter *hearing and obſerving their words was amazed at them. Afterwards he coming alone to* Everhardus *the Profeſſor of Divinity, who had been alſo preſent*

[x] *Car Bellarm. Apol. q.* 132.

at the Communion, he asked him, Did the Priest question the sick man aright? He answered yes, and whoever believes otherwise is an [y] *Heretick. Then* Peter, *weeping, and smiting his breast, cried out, Woe is me wretched Priest! How have I hitherto said Mass? For to this hour I thought that the Bread and Wine after the Consecration were only a Sacrament, that is, the sign and representation of the Lords Body and Blood.*

[y] For so it was decreed by *Innocent* 3

23. I have already touched it, that, together with the new Doctrine of Transubstantiation, there sprung up new Sects of Friers, which indeed in a short time increased beyond belief. For now to the Order of *Dominicans* (whom *Innocent* the Third had made his Inquisitors to kill and burn [z] Hereticks) was added the Order of begging *Franciscans*; and the *Augustine Eremits*, and the *Carmelites* were set up again. From these came the Schoolmen, as we now call them, whose studies (as studies were in that time) were all imployed about Commencing *Peter Lombard* Master of the Sentences.

[z] Meaning those that deny Transubstantiation.

24. These men tired their brains (as we said) about unheard of questions, touching Transubstantiation, such as pious ears would abhor to hear. For they ask, 1. Whether that be the Body of Christ which

Alex. Alens. l. 4. q. 53. m. 4. a. 1.

which ſometimes appears in the form of Fleſh, or of a Child on the Altar, and anſwer that they know not; *becauſe ſuch Apparitions happen often, and are cauſed either by mens juggling, or by the operation of the Devil.*

2. Whether the Mice (who ſometimes feaſt upon the Hoſts when they are not well ſhut up) eat the Body of Chriſt it ſelf? Or if a Dog or a Hog ſhould ſwallow down the Conſecrated Hoſt whole, whether the Lords Body ſhould paſs into their belly together with the accidents? Some indeed anſwer (other ſome being otherwiſe minded) that, *though the Body of Chriſt enters not into the Brutes mouth as corporal meat, yet it enters together with the appearances by reaſon that they are inſeparable one from the other,* (meer nonſenſe) *for as long as the accidents of the Bread* (*i. e.* the ſhape, and taſte, and colour, *&c.*) *remain in their proper* [a] *being, ſo long is the Body of Chriſt inſeparably joyned with them; wherefore if the accidents in their nature paſs into the belly, or are caſt out by vomiting, the Body of Chriſt it ſelf muſt of neceſſity go along with them: and for this cauſe pious ſouls* (I repeat their own words) *do frequently eat again with great reverence the parts of the Hoſt caſt out by vomiting.* Others anſwer alſo; [b] *That a beaſt eats not the Body of Chriſt Sacramentally, but accidentally,*

Idem q. 45. m. 1. a. 2.

a *Ibid 4. 53. m. 3.*

b *Tho. Aq. Sum. p. 3. q. 80. c. 3.*

dentally, as a man that ſhould eat a Conſecrated Hoſt, not knowing that it was conſecrated. 3. They inquire about muſty and rotten Hoſts, and becauſe the Body of Chriſt is incorruptible, and not ſubject to putrefaction, therefore they anſwer; [c] *That the Hoſts are never ſo, and that though they appear as if they were, yet in reallity they are not; as Chriſt appeared as a Gardener though he was no Gardener.* 4. They demand concerning indigeſted Hoſts which paſſing through the belly are caſt into the draught, or concerning thoſe that are caſt into the worſt of ſinks, or into the dirt. Whether ſuch Hoſts ceaſe to be the Body of Chriſt? And anſwer, [d] *That whether they be caſt into the Sink or the Privy, as long as the appearances remain, the Body of Chriſt is inſeparable from them.* And for the contrary opinion, they ſay that it is not tenable, and that it is not ſafe for any to hold it, becauſe the Pope [e] hath forbid it ſhould be maintained under pain of Excommunication. Therefore the Modern Schoolmen [f] add, *That if any ſhould hold the contrary after the Popes determination, he ſhould be condemned by the Church* (of *Rome* that is:) Nay, they hold it to be a *Point of Faith* which none may doubt of, *becauſe the contrary Doctrine hath been condemned by Pope* Gregory *the Eleventh.*

c *Alger. l. 2. c. 1.*

d *Thom. in 4. diſt. 9. q. 2. a 1. Bruliſ in 4. diſt. 13. q. 5.*

e *Greg. Papa XI.*

f *Soto in 4 diſt. 12. q. 1. a. 3. Vaſq. in 3. diſp. 195. c. 5. Direct. Inquiſ p. 1. n. 5. & p. 2. q. 10.*

5. They

5. They aſk concerning the accidents, whether the Body of Chriſt be under them when they are abſtracted from their ſubject? This is againſt Logick. Or whether Worms be gendred, or Mice nouriſhed of accidents? And this againſt Phyſick. 6. Whether the Body of Chriſt can at the very ſame time move both upwards and downwards, one Prieſt lifting up the Hoſt, and another ſetting it down. And I know not how many more ſuch thorny queſtions have wearied and nonpluſt them and all their School, and brought them to ſuch ſtraights and extremities, that they know not what to reſolve, nor what ſhifts to make. And truly it had been very happy for Religion if, as the Ancients never touched or mentioned Tranſubſtantiation, ſo latter times had never ſo much as heard of its name. For God made his Sacrament *upright* (as he did [g] *Man*) but about it they have ſought out many inventions.

[g] Eccl. 7. 29.

25. Likewiſe, this Tranſubſtantiation hath given occaſion to ſome moſt wicked and impious Wretches to abuſe and profane moſt unworthily what they thought to be the Body of Chriſt. For inſtances may be brought of ſome wicked Prieſts, who for filthy lucre have ſold ſome Conſecrated

secrated Hosts to Jews and Sorcerers, who have stabb'd and burnt them, and used them for Witchcraft and Inchantments. Nay, we read [h] that St. *Lewis* himself (very ill advised in that) gave once to the Turks and Saracens a consecrated Host as a pledge of his Promise, and an assurance of Peace. Now, can any one, who counts these things abominable, perswade himself that our Blessed Saviour would have appointed, that his most holy Body should be present in his Church in such a manner, as that it should come into the hands of his greatest Enemies, and the worst of Infidels, and be eaten by Dogs and Rats, and be vomited up, burnt, cast into Sinks, and used for Magical Poysons and Witchcraft? I mention these with horror and trembling, and therefore abstain from raking any more in this dunghill.

h *Leuncl. de rebus Turc. n.* 116.

26. No wonder therefore if this new Doctrine of *Innocent* the Third, being liable to such foul absurdities and detestable abuses, *few men could be perswaded*, in the fourteenth Century, *that the Body of Christ is really (or by Transubstantiation) in the Sacrament of the Altar*; as it is recorded by our Country-man [i] *Robert Holkot*, who lived about the middle of that Century. As also [k] *Thomas Aquinas* reports of some

i *In* 4. *q.* 3. *An.* 1350.

k 3. *q.* 75. *a.* 6.

ſome in his time, *who believed that after Conſecration, not only the accidents of the Bread, but its ſubſtantial form remained.* And *Albertus Magnus* himſelf, who was *Thomas* his his Tutor, and writ not long after *Innocent* the Third, ſpeaks of Tranſubſtantiation as of a doubtful queſtion only. Nay, that it was abſolutely rejected and oppoſed by many, is generally known; for the Anathema of *Trent* had not yet backt the *Lateran* Decree.

27. As for the reſt of the Schoolmen (eſpecially the modern) who are as it were ſworn to Pope *Innocent's* determination, they uſe to expreſs their belief in this matter with great words, but neither pious nor ſolid, in this manner; [l] *The common opinion is to be embraced, not becauſe reaſon requires it, but becauſe it is determined by the Biſhop of* Rome. Item, [m] *That ought to be of greateſt weight that we muſt hold with the holy Church of* Rome *about the Sacraments; now it holds that the Bread is Tranſubſtantiated into the Body, and the Wine into the Bloud, as it is clearly ſaid,* Extra. De fide & ſumma Trinitate. Cap. firmiter. Again, [n] *I prove that of neceſſity the Bread is changed into the Body of Chriſt, for we muſt hold that declaration of faith which the Pope declares muſt be held.* Thus among the Papiſts, if it be the pleaſure

l *Th. Argent. in* 4. d. 11. q. 1. art. 2.

m *Scot. in* 4. *diſt.* 11. q. 3.

n *Bacon in* 4. *diſt.* 8. q. 1. a. 2.

pleaſure of an imperious Pope as was *Innocent* the Third, Doctrines of Faith ſhall now and then increaſe in bulk and number, though they be ſuch as are moſt contrary to holy Scripture, though they were never heard of in the Primitive Church; and though from them ſuch conſequences neceſſarily follow, as are moſt injurious to Chriſt and his holy Religion. For after *Innocent* the Third, the *Roman* Faith was thus much [o] increaſed by the determination of Pope *Gregory* the Eleventh [p], that if it ſo happens the Body of Chriſt in the Conſecrated Hoſt may deſcend into a Rats belly, or into a Privy, or any ſuch foul place.

[o] *Ut ſupra Art.* 24.
[p] *A.* 1371.

The Council of Conſtance. An. 1415.

28. In the fifteenth Century the Council of *Conſtance* (which by a Sacrilegious attempt took away the Sacramental Cup from the People, and from the Prieſts when they do not officiate) did wrongfully condemn *Wiclif*, who was already dead, becauſe amongſt other things he had taught with the Ancients, *That the ſubſtance of the Bread and wine remains materially in the Sacrament of the Altar; and that in the ſame Sacrament, no accidents of Bread and Wine remain without a ſubſtance.* Which two Aſſertions are moſt true.

29. Cardinal

29. Cardinal *Cameracencis*, who lived about the time of the Council of *Conſtance*, doth not ſeem to own the Decree of Pope *Innocent* as the determination of the Church. For that the Bread ſhould ſtill remain, he confeſſeth, [a] *That it is poſſible: That it is not againſt reaſon or the authority of the Bible.* But concerning the converſion of the Bread he ſays, *That clearly it cannot be inferred from Scripture, nor yet from the determination of the Church*, as he judgeth. Yet becauſe the common opinion was otherwiſe, he yielding to the times was fain to follow, though with ſome reluctancy.

Card. Cameracenſis An. 1420.

a *In* 4. *q.* 6. *a.* 2.

30. The Council of *Florence*, which was not long after, did not at all treat with the *Greeks* about Tranſubſtantiation, nor the Conſecration of the Sacrament, but left them undetermined, with many other Controverſies. But that which is called the *Armenians* inſtruction (and in this cauſe, and almoſt all Diſputes is cited as the Decree of the General Council of *Florence*, by [b] *Soto*, [c] *Bellarmine*, and the *Roman* [d] Catechiſm) is no Decree of the Council, as we have demonſtrated [e] ſomewhere elſe; but a falſe and forged Decree of Pope *Eugenius* the

The Council of Florence, An. 1439.

Inſtructio ad Armen.

b *In* 4. *diſt.* 11. *q.* 1. *art.* 2.

c *De Euch. l.* 4. *c.* 13.

d *Part.* 2. *c.* 4. *num.* 18.

e In the Hiſtory of the Canon of Scripture, *p.* 158.

Fourth,

Fourth, who doth indeed in that Inſtruction preſcribe to the *Armenians* a form of Doctrine about the Sacrament, ſaying, *That by vertue of the words of Chriſt, the ſubſtance of the Bread is turned into his Body, and the ſubſtance of the Wine into his Bloud*: But that he did it with the approbation of the Council, as he often ſays in his Decree, is proved to be altogether falſe, as well by the Acts of the Council, as by the unanſwerable Arguments of [f] *C. de Capite Fontium*, Archbiſhop of *Cæſarea*, in his Book *De neceſſaria Theologiæ Scholaſticæ correctione*, dedicated to Pope *Sixtus* the Fifth. For how could the Council of *Florence* approve that Decree which was made more than three months after it was ended? It being certain, that after the Council was [g] done, the *Armenians* with the *Greeks*, having each of them ſigned Letters of Union, (which yet were not approved by all, nor long in force after they were ſubſcribed) departed out of *Florence July* 22, whereas the Inſtruction was not given while *November* 22. Therefore by the mutual conſent of both Parties was nothing here done or decreed about Tranſubſtantiation, or the reſt of the Articles of the new Roman Faith. But *Eugenius*, or whoever was the Forger of the Decree,

f *C de Cap. Font. de neceſſ. cor. Schol. The. p.* 51, 53, *&* 56.

g *Ex Act. Conc. Flor.*

Decree, put a cheat upon his Reader. Perhaps he had ſeen the ſame done by *Innocent* the Third, or *Gregory* the Ninth, in the pretended Decrees of the Council of *Lateran*, which were the Popes only, but not the Council's. And certainly it is more likely *Eugenius* did it rather to pleaſe himſelf, than for any hopes he could have that at his command the *Armenians* would receive and obey his Inſtruction ſooner than the *Greeks*. For to this day *the* [h] *Armenians believe that the Elements of Bread and Wine retain their nature in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt.*

h *Joh. Laſic. de Relig. Armeniorum.*

31. By theſe any conſidering perſon may eaſily ſee, that Tranſubſtantiation is a meer novelty; not warranted either by Scripture or Antiquity; invented about the middle of the Twelfth Century, out of ſome miſunderſtood Sayings of ſome of the Fathers; confirmed by no Eccleſiaſtick or Papal Decree before the year 1215. afterwards received only here and there in the *Roman* Church; debated in the Schools by many diſputes; liable to many very bad conſequences; rejected (for there was never thoſe wanting that oppoſed it) by many great and pious men, until it was maintained in the Sacrilegious Council of *Conſtance*; and at laſt in the

the year 1551. confirmed in the Council of [i] *Trent*, by a few Latine Biſhops, Slaves to the *Roman* See; impoſed upon all, under pain of an Anathema to be feared by none; and ſo ſpread too too far, by the tyrannical and moſt unjuſt command of the [k] Pope. So that we have no reaſon to embrace it, untill it ſhall be demonſtrated, that except the ſubſtance of the Bread be changed into the very Body of Chriſt, his words cannot poſſibly be true; nor his Body preſent. Which will never be done.

i *Concil. Trident. Seſſ.* 13.

k *Bulla Pii* 4. *de profeſs. fidei.*

23 AP 57

A

A Table of the places of Scripture cited in this Book.

Exod XII. 11, 21.	Chap. I.	Art. 4
Eccl. VII. 29.	Chap. VII.	24
St. *Mat.* XXVI. 26.	Chap. I.	1
St. *Luk.* XXII. 19.	*Ibid.*	
St. *Joh.* III. 3.	Chap. VI.	7
St. *Joh.* III. 29.	Chap. VII.	19
St. *Joh.* VI. 55.	Chap. I.	5
Rom. XII. 3.	Chap. VI.	7
1 *Cor.* IV. 15.	*Ibid.*	
1 *Cor.* X. 16.	Chap. I.	1
1 *Cor.* X. 3, & 4,	*Ibid.*	
Gal. VI. 15.	Chap. VII.	7
Eph. IV. 22.	*Ibid.*	
1 *Pet.* I. 3.	*Ibid.*	
Jude v 3.	In the Preface.	

A Table of the Ancient Fathers.

Century I.		
Clemens Romanus	Chap. VI.	Art. 1
St. *Ignatius*	*Ibid.*	10
Century II.		
Theoph. Antioch.	Chap. VI.	
Justinus Martyr.	Chap. V.	
	—— VI.	1
Athenagoras, *Tatianus*	Chap. VI.	
Irenæus,	Chap. V.	
	—— VI.	5, &
Century III.		
Tertullian,	Chap. V.	
	—— VI.	

Origenes,	Chap V.	10
	—— VI.	5,& 7
Cyprian,	Chap. V.	11
	—— VI.	7,8,& 12
Clem. Alexand.	Chap. VI.	1,& 7
Minutius Felix,	*Ibid.*	
Arnobius,	Chap. V.	35
	Century IV.	
Euseb. Cæsar.	Chap. VI.	1
Athanasius,	Chap. V.	13
Cyril. Hieros.	*Ibid.*	14
	—— VI.	5, & 7
Juvencus,		
Macarius,		
Hilarius,		
Optatus,		
Euseb. Emiss.		
Greg. Naz.	Chap. VI.	1
Cyril. Alex.		
Epiphanius,		6, & 7
Hieronimus,		
Theoph. Alex.		6
Gaudentius,		
St. *Basil.*	Chap. V.	15
	—— VI.	7
Greg Nyss.	Chap. V.	16
	—— VI.	7
Ambrosius,	Chap. V.	17
	—— VI.	6,7,13
Chrysost.	Chap. V.	Art. 18
	—— VI.	6,7,8
	Century V.	
St. *Austin,*	Chap. V.	19
Prosper III.	Chap. V.	20
Leo IV.		
		Theodoret.

Theodoret.	Chap. V.	21
	—— VI.	10
Gelasius,	Chap. V.	22
Sedulius, *Gennadius,*	Chap. VI.	1
Faustus Reg.	*Ibid.*	7
	Century VI.	
Ephrem,	Chap. V.	24
Facundus,	*Ibid.*	25
Fulgentius.	Chap. VI.	1
Victor Antioch. *Primasius,* *Procop. Gaz.*	Chap. VI.	1
	Century VII.	
Isidorus Hispal.	Chap. V.	26
Hesychius,	Chap. VI.	1, & 2
Maximus,	*Ibid.*	1
	Century VIII.	
Vener. Beda,	Chap. V.	27
Carol. Magnus,	*Ibid.*	28
Damascenus,	Chap. VI.	1
	Century IX.	
Paschasius,	Chap. V.	29
Amalarius,	——	30
Rabanus Maurus,	——	31
Joh. Erigena,	——	32
Wal. Strabo,	——	33
Bertramus	——	34
Niceph. Patria. *Hincmarus,*	Chap. VI.	Art. 1
	Century X.	
Herigerus,	Chap. V.	36
Fulbertus,	Chap. VI.	1
	Century XI.	
Idem *Fulbertus,*	Chap. VII.	3
Berengarius,	*Ibid.*	4, 5, 6, &c.

Hildebertus,	Chap. VII.	4
Theophylact, *Oecumenius*,	Chap. VI.	7
Century XII.		
Bernardus,	Chap. VII.	13
	—— III.	2
Rupertus,	Chap. VII.	14

A Table of the Schoolmen.

Century XIII.		
Lombardus,	Chap. VII.	Art. 15
Alex. Alensis,	*Ibid.*	24
	—— VI.	2
Albertus Magnus,	*Ibid.*	26
Tho. Aquinas,	—	2
Rich. de Mediavilla,	Chap. VII.	10
Century XIV.		
Scotus, *Durandus*, *Occamus*,	Chap. V.	2
Baconus,	Chap. VII.	27
Holcotus,	——	26
Th. Argent.	——	27
Brulifer,	——	24
Century XV.		
Card. *Camer.*	Chap. V.	Art. 3
	—— VII.	29
Gabriel Biel,	*Ibid*	
Century XVI.		
Cajetan,	*Ibid.*	
Dom. Soto.	Chap. VII.	24

A Table of the Councils.

Nicene I.	Chap. V	Art. 12
Calced.	*Ibid.*	23

A Table.

Ancyran.		
Neocæsarien.		
Laodiceum,		
Carthagin.		
Aurelian.	Chap. VI.	1
Toletanum IV.		
Braccarense,		
Toletan. VI.		
Constantin. VI.		
Brixiense,	Chap. VII.	12
Anglican.	Chap V.	36
	—— VI.	2
Arelatense III.	—— VI.	2
Vercellense,	Chap. VII.	7
Turonense,	*Ibid.*	8
Rom. sub Nicol. II.	*Ibid.*	9
Rom. sub Greg. VII.	*Ibid.*	12
Lateran. sub Innoc. III.	*Ibid.*	18
Constantiense,	*Ibid.*	28
Florentinum,	*Ibid.*	30
Tridentinum,	*Ibid.*	31

A Table of the Popes.

LEO IX.	Chap. VII.	Art. 7
Victor II.	——	8
Nicholas II.	——	9
Gregory VII.	——	12
Innocent III.	——	18, 19, &c.
Gregory IX.	Chap. VI.	7
Gregory XI.	Chap. VII.	24, 27
	—— VI.	2
Engenius IV.	*Ibid.*	30
Pius IV.	*Ibid.*	31
	—— IV.	7

A Table of the Hiſtorians.

Photius,	Chap. V	Art. 24
Trithem.	——	31
Malmesbury,	——	31, 32
	—— VII.	4, 6, 12
Antonius,	*Ibid.*	32
Vincentius,	—— V, & VII.	12
Sigebert,	*Ibid.*	36
	—— VII.	6
Thevet,	Chap. VII.	4
Pap. Maſſ.	Chap. VII.	9
Mat. Paris,	——	6, 20
M. Weſtm.	*Ibid.*	
Baronius,	——	9, 12
Sigonius,	——	9
Chron. Caſſin.	——	13
Engilb. Trevir.	——	12
Bertold. Conſt., *Benno Card.*, *Abbas Uſperg.*	*Ibid.*	
Otho Friſing.	*Ibid.*	16
Platina,	——	20
Tho. Walſing., *Diſcip. de Temp.*, *Cæſarius Monach.*	*Ibid.*	22
Leunclavius,	——	26
Laſicius,	——	30

A Table of the Confeſſions of Reformed Churches.

Anglican.	Chap. II.	Art. 3
Auguſtan.	*Ibid.*	8
Saxon.	——	9

Wittemberg.

A Table.

Wittemberg.	——	Art. 10
Bohem.	——	11
Polon.	——	12 & 19
Argentin. & Basil.	——	13
Gallica,	——	14 & 15
Belgica,	——	16
Helvet. prior & posterior.	*Ibid.*	17 & 18

A Table of the Reformed Authors.

Luther,	Chap. II.	Art. 13
Bucerus,	*Ibid.*	
Zuinglius,		
Oecolamp.		
Poinetus,	——	4
Juellus,	——	3
Bilson.	——	5
Andrews,	——	
Jacobus Rex,	——	6
Hooker.	*Ibid.*	
Joh. Episc. Roffens.		
Montacut.		
Armachan.		
Franc. Episc. Elienſ.		
Laud.		
Overal.		
Anton. de Dom.	*Ibid.*	7
Calvinus,	*Ibid.*	20
Colloq. Ratisb.	Chap. V.	22

A Table of the Papists Authors.

Bellarmin.	Chap. III.	Art. 1, & 2
	—— IV.	7
	—— V.	3, 5, 18, 21, 22

Salmeron,

	—— VI.	10,13,14,16
	—— VII.	17,22,30
Salmeron,	Chap. IV.	7
Tolet,	Chap. IV.	7
Roffens.	Chap. V.	3
Perron.	*Ibid.*	13
Possevin.	*Ibid.*	18, 35
	—— VII.	17
Steph. Gard.	Chap. V.	18
Greg. de Valen.	*Ibid.*	21
Præfat. in Theod.	*Ibid.*	
Sirmond.	——	25
Tho. Walden.	——	31
	—— VII.	12
Index lib. proh.	Chap. V.	35
Indices Expurg.	*Ibid.*	
Sixt. Senens.	*Ibid.*	
Vasquez.	Chap. VI.	2
	—— VII.	24
Direct. Inquis.	Chap. VI.	12
	—— VII.	24
Alph. à Castro,	Chap. VI.	16
Discursus de Jesuit.	*Ibid.*	
Watson quodlib.	*Ibid.*	
Garetius,	Chap. VII.	4
Alanus,	*Ibid.*	
Lanfrancus	*Ibid.*	5,7,10
Guitmundus	*Ibid.*	11
P. Blesens.	*Ibid.*	17
St. Eduens.	*Ibid.*	
Gerson,	*Ibid.*	22
Catechis. Trid.	*Ibid.*	30
De Capite Fontium,	*Ibid.*	
Algerus,	*Ibid.*	24
Gratiani Glossator,	*Ibid.*	10

23 AP 57

FINIS.